# Modern Philology

Vol. VII

January, 1910

No. 3

## PIERS PLOWMAN, THE WORK OF ONE OR OF FIVE A REPLY

I ought perhaps to apologize for offering today a refutation of Professor Manly's refutation of my refutation of his refutation of the usually accepted ideas concerning Piers Plowman. In the new article published by him in Modern Philology, July, 1909, he announces further statements for the time when he shall have "found a method for presenting some of his results that satisfies him;" and he also complains that in my own article of January, 1909, the "arrangement of parts is skilfully devised to break such force as the arguments of the adversary may have when properly massed and valued." To avoid censure, it would apparently be better to wait till he had himself massed all his arguments.

But, without forestalling what may pertain to the future, it is, I hope, not amiss to answer now what has been propounded up to now, and to state the reasons why, after having studied Professor Manly's new essay, I persist in my former belief. I shall content myself, for the time being, with making one general statement, and offering a series of remarks which I noted down as I read the attempted refutation.

#### T

My general statement is to the effect that, in the maze of all those denyings and contestings, and those recurring assertions that

<sup>1</sup> Pp. 41 and 2.

289]

1 [MODERN PHILOLOGY, January, 1910]

the disputant has not understood or not quite understood his opponent, that his "new 'connecting link' is too weak to sustain even its own weight," that he has missed the point, etc., the reader may well miss the point too and forget what question is at stake and what Professor Manly has undertaken to prove.

As I recalled at the beginning of my first article, from the fourteenth century to the twentieth, *Piers Plowman*—a very characteristic poem, none truly like it—has been considered the work of one man; such testimonies as we possess are unanimous; there is not one to the contrary. Professor Manly does his best to diminish their value: not improbably, however, he would be glad if he had a tenth of it on his side, but it is a fact that he has none.

Such being the case, he comes forth with a theory of his own, which he must make good, and according to which Piers Plowman is not the work of any Langland at all, but was written by four different men; he even says five, but I persist in not counting John But and his few lines. These four men, having the same interest in the same problems, the same modesty, the same taste for anonymity, being all of them "men of notable intellectual power, and of ideas and aims of the same general tendency (notwithstanding individual differences)," being all of them "sincere men, interested primarily in the influence of their satire and finding themselves in hearty sympathy, despite minor differences, with the poem as it reached them" (pp. 2, 17), took up, we are told, the work in turn, remodeled it, each according to his own will, spoiling, in spite of their "notable intellectual power," many passages, and failing to understand others—the spoilings and failures being moreover of such grievous nature that a difference of authorship is thereby evidenced. Hence, of course, the necessity of admitting the remarkable phenomenon that each of those sincere men, of notable intellectual power, with a fondness for political and religious allegory, was careful to die, mothlike, as I said, just as he had "laid" his poem. Else, how would the sincere and clever predecessor have allowed his work to go about the world garbled, as we hear, mangled, and tagged with continuations not his own?—especially when a continuation had been contemplated from the first, and had even, as I have shown been

<sup>1</sup> P. 7 of my article in Modern Philology, January, 1909.

foreshadowed in the part allotted by Professor Manly to the earliest of his supposed four poets.

If the garblings and failures to understand are so deep, great, and grievous as to denote a difference of authors, the surviving authors, one or two of them at least, would have given his own continuation, but none did. Professor Manly cannot say both that those faults and differences are so great as to demonstrate a difference of authorship, and that they are not so great as to have tempted any of his authors 1, 2, and 3 to protest and to set right the misdeeds of his authors 2, 3, and 4.

When Jean de Meun wrote his conclusion for the Roman de la Rose, Guillaume de Lorris was dead; when Sir W. Alexander wrote his for Sidney's Arcadia, Sidney was dead, and there could not be any protests. When Marti, on the contrary, gave his continuation of Guzman de Alfarache, Mateo Aleman was not dead, and he hastened to write and publish his own continuation. When the so-called Avellaneda issued, nine years after the first part of Don Quixote, a second one of his own making, Cervantes dropped the trifling works with which he had been busy, wrote with all speed his own continuation, expressed the bitterest indignation at the audacity of the intruder, and took care to kill Don Quixote outright in that second part, so as to be safe in the future.

All the chances are that, in order to have existed at all, Professor Manly's modest, sincere, and clever men must have died, with due punctuality, each after he had written, so as to make room for a successor and garbler: no small wonder.<sup>1</sup>

Given this self-assumed task, and the fact that there is not a trace of external evidence to support the theory of a quadruple authorship, the only sort of proof Mr. Manly can adduce is that resulting precisely from those mistakes, failures to notice or understand, spoilings of passages, differences in thoughts, meter, language and literary value. And he must, first, carefully separate what may be due to scribes and what to his several authors. I have pointed out how much, in the matter of dialect for example, may be due to scribes; the important article of Mr. R. W. Chambers and Mr. J. H. G.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> I again say nothing of John But about whom Professor Manly writes, "We hear of no protest" (p. 18). No one protested against him because no one heard of him. He could well in any case be let alone.

Grattan in the Modern Language Review of April, 1909, much better shows, not only that version B approximates more closely than was usually believed version A, but that, on the other hand, we are much further removed from the author's original text than was commonly supposed, several layers of MSS intervening between that text and those we possess: so that it is no easy matter to guess, in difficult passages, in questions of meter, dialect, etc., what is his and what may be due to what they rightly call an "editing scribe."

Professor Manly has to show, besides, that whenever, in the history of literature, such differences and mistakes as he thinks he detects, such spoilings or discardings of fine passages, have been found in the various versions or editions of a work, then, surely and invariably, a difference of author is the cause. If it can be pointed out that discrepancies as great exist between revisions or continuations of poems certainly due to the same author, his system falls through, for the discrepancies pointed out by him will be then no proof at all, and he has not two orders of proofs, he has only that one. This I consider the main point at stake, the keystone of the whole discussion.

It is not a little strange that, in his essays on the authorship of *Piers Plowman*, Mr. Manly entirely neglected this side of the question. He collected in the various versions of the poem as many mistakes and differences as he could, and without comparing them with any similar cases, drew outright from them his own conclusions, which are, as we know, of a very large order. I called attention, in my sections III and VIII, to some such parallel cases, showing how considerable differences in style, ideas, ways of thinking, meter, merit, etc., how grievous mistakes and lapsuses may be discovered in revisions or continuations certainly not due to a second, third, or fourth author, but to the original one.

I cannot help thinking that it is an inadequate answer for Professor Manly to say that, as for Ronsard, "he has not examined the revisions he made in his text" (p. 50), and that, as for Robinson Crusoe, he can speak only from a somewhat distant recollection, not having read it "since about 1891."

I had, to the same effect, quoted Tasso's two Gerusalemme, and these Mr. Manly has "examined with some care," but he has found that, except for "the exclusion of many episodes and the systematic assimilation of the heroes to antique models," the second *Gerusalemme* is, if anything, better than the first, "usually richer and more powerful in style, more concise and more packed with meaning" (p. 52).

I shall not express any opinion of my own on the question of literary merit; my ways of thinking might differ somewhat widely from those of Professor Manly, for I see that the line added in version C of *Piers Plowman* and praised by me, in which Langland pictures himself as beholding, at the opening of his poem,

### Al the welthe of this worlde and the woo bothe,

must have been, according to Mr. Manly, the work "fundamentally," not of a poet but of a "topographer" (p. 49). I certainly fail to detect the topographer. In the Tasso question, the best is, maybe, to abide by the judgment of critics who had no chance of being biased and auto-suggested by the present discussion, as they wrote before it: their verdict is not doubtful. Perhaps, however, it might be enough to recall that Mr. Manly himself recognizes, at least, that remarkable differences exist between the two Gerusalemme, and that there is in the second "a systematic assimilation of the heroes to antique models." When we remember the importance he attaches to a (quite imaginary, as I think) difference of merit in B's description of Wrath as compared to the other sins in A, there is nothing rash in surmising that he would have drawn a not insignificant argument in favor of a multiple authorship had he been so lucky as to find that the portraits of "Pernel proud herte" and Glotoun in version A, had been replaced by portraits of Juno and Bacchus in version B.

I may also add that, in this all-important question of comparisons, I quoted just a few examples, but it would be easy to quote more: this is a ground which has as much to be cleared before we arrive at a conclusion, as the question of the "tabular presentation of statistics" which we are promised (p. 41), concerning sentence structure, versification, etc.—which presentation will have to be accompanied by a careful discrimination between what may be due to an "editing scribe" and to the author; and also and necessarily by a minute comparison with the remodelings by other writers of their own

<sup>1</sup> Cf. below, remark 16.

works, or by their publishing various works of their own at various periods and under different circumstances.

Such men as Rabelais, for example, will have to be remembered. His first editions are full of local and dialectal peculiarities of which no trace remains in his later revisions: "Rabelais," writes Mr. Baur, "issues in 1535 his *Gargantua*, the first edition of which seems to appeal to a public especially Lyonnese, being full of Lyonnese words and local allusions that he erased when his books reached universal fame."

From the point of view of changes in political or philosophical ideals, such men will have to be discussed, too, as the one concerning whose Odes Sainte Beuve wrote: "At each page, a violent hatred against the Revolution, a frantic adoration of monarchical souvenirs, a frenzied faith more anxious for the martyr's palm than the poet's laurel." Victor Hugo must surely have been several men, since it is that staunch supporter of democracy whom Sainte Beuve could thus describe once in an article in the Globe.

Concerning the more or less suitable changes a poet may introduce in his work—plot, style, aim, etc.—when he writes three versions of it, account will have to be taken of authors whom we can speak of with certainty, because they are modern, and that we know exactly what occurred in their case, and whether they were one each or several.

A conspicuous example of a treble version has been recently studied by Mr. Christian Maréchal, who certainly never heard of the present controversy, and who writes of those three versions in words strangely similar to those used by Professor Manly with regard to *Piers Plowman*, except that he notices greater and more striking differences in the case of Lamartine and the various texts of his *Jocelyn*.

Three versions of this poem,<sup>2</sup> the two first left unfinished, have come down to us in manuscript. As first conceived, and as appears from the text of version I, the poem was to be short, with well-defined aims, no wanderings, imagination being held in check, a sense of measure governing the whole. Lamartine calls it at that time

<sup>1</sup> A. Baur, Maurice Scève, 1906, p. 60.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Josselin inédit de Lamartine, d'après les manuscrits originaux (the name of the hero is written thus in all the MSS), Parls, 1909, Introd. chap. ii, "Les trois Poèmes."

a poemetto, and says: "cela aura quatre chants," of which we have two, but we possess the plan of the two others. His firm intention to continue it in the same style, and the pleasure he took in that style, are shown by a letter to his best friend, Count de Virieu, in which he writes: "This is my masterpiece; nothing of this sort will have been read before." A strong argument this, in favour of a multiple authorship in case changes were to occur; and they did.

In version II, grave alterations are noticeable; the poet, writes Mr. Maréchal, "is carried away by an inspiration, generous no doubt, but perhaps too rich, and of which, in any case, he is no longer the master." The third canto now contains what was to be the conclusion of the second. He adds "fine episodic digressions for which there was no room in the first plan." In this state, "the poem differs as much from the first version as from the last. It differs from the first by the abundance of descriptions . . . . by the lack of equilibrium," etc. It differs even more from the third, where the very groundwork of the poem, its religious and philosophical aim, are deeply altered. While the hero of the second version "reached religious resignation through his trials," in the third he becomes "the man of nature . . . indomitably standing against religious and social order, to which he opposes his rights and whose victim he thinks he is." The goal we thus reach is the antipodes of that for which we had started: the poet had begun with the intention of offering us a kind of soul's tonic, and he leaves us "languid and weakened."

Literary differences are no less glaring between the three versions. In the first text, the "sense of measure and proportion" is remarkable; indeed, far more so than in Langland's version A. "The action," says Mr. Maréchal, "proceeds and develops with a regularity which is reassuring and shows the poet ever the master-of his inspiration. On the contrary, after the first part of the second epoch," a word Lamartine chose, on second thoughts, instead of canto, as Langland chose passus, "description assumes disquieting proportions, and, from the fourth epoch especially, one feels that facility takes command and that discipline is silenced." Far from checking himself, the author's way of writing and composing becomes, as he

<sup>1</sup> Dec. 11, 1831, ibid., p. xxviii.

proceeds, more and more loose. "This defect is especially perceptible in the truly extraordinary manner in which the ninth epoch is formed around a fragment originally written for the sixth, and under conditions such that Lamartine, while he wrote the several parts thereof, not only ignored the places those fragments would occupy with regard to each other, but even, as evidenced by the state of the manuscript, did not know whether they would end by forming a ninth epoch at all when put together." Version III is, to sum up, remarkable for "le relâchement de la forme."

I cannot but recommend a study of these newly published documents to anyone who may be tempted to find proofs of a multiple authorship in Langland's changes of mood, style, merit, or thoughts. He will find that the changes are greater in Lamartine; and, as they occurred in the space of four years, while it took Langland nine times longer to change much less, he will reach the conclusion that, if one of the two was several men instead of only one, it must have been Lamartine, not Langland.

#### II

The remarks which I now beg to offer are the following ones:

1.—On the unique characteristics of Langland, I cannot but maintain word for word what I said, namely that "alone in Europe, and what is more remarkable, alone in his country, he gives us a true impression of the grandeur of the internal reform that had been going on in England during the century: the establishment on a firm basis of that institution unique then . . . . the Westminister Parliament." I pointed out, in a previous work, that most of the aspirations of Langland can be paralleled by petitions of the Commons, and that no other poem offers anything of the kind, Chaucer having not even an allusion to the phenomenon, though having been himself a member of Parliament, and describing his Knight as having been one too.

This fact remains a fact. It will change nothing to show, as Mr. Manly says he will another day, that Alain Chartier gave (in the following century) "reasons for not admitting political discussion to his poetry but reserving it for prose" (p. 3). The example of

<sup>1</sup> Pp. xxviii, xxxiii, xliv, xlvi.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> First version begun, November, 1831, third version finished, November, 1835.

Langland, and especially of Gower, who did admit political discussion in their poetry, was surely the one to have influenced Chaucer if he was to be influenced at all, but he was not. No "discussion," moreover, would have been needed for Chaucer to show that he had been impressed in some way by the colossal change that had occurred in his country, and in his country alone, in his days, before his very eyes: a word would have been enough, such a word as we find in Froissart, but he has it not. I stated this because it is so, and because it shows, with the rest, how Langland stands apart. The "implied criticism" of Chaucer which Mr. Manly thinks he detects in my words is quite out of the question.

2.—I persist in thinking that Langland was, as nearly as can be, uninfluenced and unbiased by foreign ideas, principles, and sentiments. By which I do not mean that no reminiscences of "French and Latin literature" (p. 3) can be found in his work: I pointed out myself a number of such reminiscences in my *Piers Plowman*, 1894.

3.—To ask (p. 3) whether I require the reader to "believe that Parliament had some esoteric doctrine, some high ideals of government kept secret from the people," is to lend me a hypothetical absurdity which I certainly never propounded. My plea has not only nothing to do with it but is the very reverse of it: the parliamentary changes were great and notorious; yet they found no echo in literature except in *Piers Plowman*, which by this stands alone.

How Marsiglio of Padua, the bold theorician of the first part of the fourteenth century, can be quoted (p. 4) to gainsay my statement, I fail to see. The question reflected in *Piers Plowman* is not one of theory, but one of actual and real practice, not of the first half of the fourteenth century (when that practice had not yet fully developed) but of the second; not of nations in general, but of England in particular. I say: Langland alone gives us a true impression of that English internal reform and of its grandeur—I am answered: do not forget Marsiglio of Padua who had abroad noteworthy theories before any such reform had been realized anywhere.

An argument is drawn (p. 4) from the fact that the fine line "might of the communes" etc. is spoiled in C. So it is, at least in such texts as have come down to us, but what of it? Langland, while writing in his old age the last revision of his work, sometimes

improved and sometimes spoiled it, just as was the case with Ronsard, Tasso, and others.

Professor Manly is afraid that I read into the passage "might of the communes" "very modern ideas" (p. 5), which would certainly be a grievous fault. But, without pleading that I have made for many years some study of the period and might perhaps be entitled to venture an opinion, I beg to point out that what Langland describes in these words, and what I say that he describes, is what actually took place in his days; and we have Professor Manly's own assurance that the doctrines thus condensed "were commonly and widely held among the people of England" (p. 3). I did not read anything either modern or otherwise into those lines, and scarcely did more than quote them.

Wonder is expressed thereupon (p. 5) at Langland having said nothing of the Peasants' revolt "in the poems" attributed to him: by which poems must doubtless be understood his last revision, written, as I think I showed, about 1398, that is seventeen years after the revolt, while the two other versions were written years before it. Professor Manly considers somehow that such a neglect points to a multiple authorship; this omission would be extraordinary if the three versions are by one author and quite natural if by four or five. It seems difficult to agree, especially when we remember that, according to the same critic, those four men had "ideas and aims of the same general tendency." If yet the question were maintained and we were asked to say why Langland did not mention the revolt, the answer would be: for the same cause that Shakespeare neglected to speak of "Magna Charta" in his account of a reign of which it was the most important event. Professor Manly merrily asks if Langland was "alone in England ignorant of [these things];" let him

4.—I had spoken of Langland as having his work "for his life's companion and confidant." Professor Manly answers (p. 6) that then his "carelessness and indifference concerning the condition in which his poem was published . . . . is, to say the least, remarkable."—But it has nothing out of the common. Care for the work and care for the copies (and in our days for the proofs) of the work do not necessarily go together. Examples are not hard to find of people

put the same question to Shakespeare.

who put their soul in their writings and who neglected to see that the copies going about were correct; the names of Shakespeare and Sidney will, I suppose, occur to everybody. Mr. Manly insists on the fact that I spoke of the Visions as being Langland's "continuous occupation," the subject of his "constant occupation," he being "constantly occupied with his text" (pp. 5, 7, 19). I never said that he was constantly occupied with the copies of his text—and besides I did not use at all, to any such intent, the words "constant," "constantly," "continuous."

5.—Concerning scribes and what I had said of their possible mistakes, Professor Manly has recourse throughout his article to much irony and banter in order to persuade his readers that I attributed more than their due to "those careless professional scribes" to the "persistent carelessness of the scribes . . . . [which] must have sorely irritated the professional soul of W. Langland" to that scribe who "is surely a most troublesome person." This sort of leit-motiv recurs from place to place.

I have only to point out that, in their independent work, and after the most minute inspection of the Piers Plowman MSS that was ever made, Messrs. Chambers and Grattan lay to the door of "the careless scribe," much more than I ever did. "What Dr. Moore has," they say, "remarked of the early MSS of the Divine Comedy, is equally true of the MSS of Piers Plowman: their writers are not exact copyists, but editors, although working without an editor's sense of responsibility." They show, moreover, that the best texts we possess have sometimes undergone twice in succession the revision of an editing scribe, so that we are necessarily, at times, rather far from the original composition. The two best MSS of A are the Vernon and the Harleian ones, of which our authors say that, not only they were edited by their scribes, but that "their common ancestor was also an edited MS." The same critics detect "sophistication" in certain texts of the Visions, and they do not refer it to the author or to several authors with a mangling disposition, but only to scribes.4

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The only place where I find, in my article, the word "constantly" used with reference to this is at p. 17, where it comes in only to be qualified in the remark that Langland had "more or less constantly" beside him a text of his poem.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Pp. 7, 18, 35. 
<sup>3</sup> Modern Language Review, April, 1909, p. 368. 
<sup>4</sup> Ibid., p. 378.

Professor Manly finds it "somewhat difficult to understand the relations [of these careless professional scribes] to Langland" (p. 7). He is very lucky if he finds it only somewhat difficult. Such relations, about which he has many jokes, are one of the hardest problems of mediaeval literature. The best authority in such matters pronounces it "insoluble." We can only make suppositions, but we can make more probable ones than those Professor Manly playfully recommends to our acceptance: either that in which he gives to the author's wife and daughter a part to play, or that according to which "the admiration and interest of [amateur copyists] would have led them to ask the author where these loose slips and fly-leaves belonged "(p.7).-They would in fact never have asked, because they would never have noticed. In such an irregular work, discrepancies are not very striking: and they struck no one, in fact, neither scribe, printer, nor literary critic, for five centuries, until Professor Manly himself pointed out two or three (and I one more).

Some of the reasoning in the same paragraph is difficult to follow, more difficult to accept. "Were the scribes," Professor Manly asks, p. 7, "paid by other men who had read or heard of the poem and wished copies for themselves? If [this] be assumed, what becomes of the mystery in which the author enveloped his identity?"—As if it were an extraordinary phenomenon, an unheard-of thing, that an anonymous poem, or one whose author is but doubtfully known, may have become famous and the copies sought for.

In the same paragraph again we are referred to C, XIV, 117 ff., with the intent of showing that Langland evinces there his aversion for the scribe who copies carelessly, and that he would therefore have keenly resented the misdeeds of any such when his own work was at stake—just as if he had been another Chaucer. But in that passage, Langland simply enumerates what defects make a "chartre chalangable" before the courts; it is a very special case, as far removed as can be from the copying of poetical MSS, and it is very bold to deduce from it conclusions as to the poet's personal views about

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>A charter is chalangable 'by-fore a chief Justice, Yf fals Latyn be in that lettere 'the lawe hit enpugneth, Other peynted par-entrelignarie' parcels over-skipped; The gome that so gloseth chartres 'a goky is yholden. So is he a goky by god 'that in the godspel failleth.

scribes in general, and about the trouble he must have taken to personally correct the copies made of his own work.

Such an attitude as Langland's has nothing wonderful. Cervantes knew of the criticisms made as to the strange way in which the stealing of Sancho's ass is narrated in the first part of *Don Quixote*; he wrote a kind of defense nine years later, but does not seem to have troubled himself in the interval to verify how the text stood that had been so criticised, and it is very difficult to make his reply fit (as shown below, remark 16) either those criticisms, or the passages doubtfully his, or even those certainly written by himself. Yet he was not indifferent to his work; far from it, as his indignation against the author of a sham continuation sufficiently shows.

Referring, p. 8, to MSS Univ. Coll. Oxford, and Rawlinson Poet. 137 which contain a "jumble of incoherent facts" (read patches: Mr. Manly's own scribe must have betrayed him), Professor Manly objects, that "the confusion was not in the author's MS, but in a later copy." I quite agree and ever did, and do not see how my words can be taken to mean that I believed the scribes to have had, in this case, Langland's autograph in their hands. My words were to the effect that the two MSS in question were copied "from the same original which offered a good text," though the leaves had been disarranged, and this certainly does not point to the author's autograph. I had quoted this example in a note. simply to recall to what extent scribes could carry carelessness and indifference to sense: there were, as the event shows, scribes negligent enough to issue such copies without noticing their absurdity; any text given men of their stamp with leaves or slips in a wrong order would be copied by them unflinchingly wrong. Such accidental misplacings as might happen in Langland's own MS (and it so turns out that, judging by the result, they were neither numerous nor glaring and easy to detect) would pass unnoticed by scribes like these, and by many of their betters.

6.—There is, in Professor Manly's article, a good deal of discussion (pp. 9 ff.) concerning what I said of Langland's allowing copyists to transcribe his work at various moments when it was in the making. I am quite willing to wait till Messrs. Chambers and Grattan have finished their inspection of the MSS. But whatever may be thought

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Note 3, p. 4 of my article. Cf. Chambers and Grattan, ut supra, p. 376.

or discovered with respect to each of the separate examples I quoted, the author did, at all events, to a notable extent, what I said, as his poem was indeed ever in the making, and as, when text A was allowed to be copied, the poem was not finished; when B was made public it was not finished either, and when C appeared the work was left definitively incomplete.

I continue firmly convinced that, from the first, the author had in his mind, as the subject of his work, the three episodes that are in it (the last being left unfinished), namely the episodes of Meed, of Piers, and of Dowel-Dobet-Dobest: and that, contrary to what Professor Manly alleges (p. 12), the A text was not, in the poet's thought, a complete whole. Various mentions in A of Dobet and Dobest are quoted by Professor Manly to sustain his theory, but we find nothing there save a preparation for what was to follow at a later period, and it is only of Dowel that we really hear in that version. The rubrics in MSS seem to me to give a correct idea of what was planned by the author as early as version A. At the end of passus viii, where we had first become acquainted with Dowel, we read: "Incipit Vita de Do-wel, Do-bet et Do-best," and it cannot be pretended that A gives us thereupon anything more than the "Vita de Do-wel." In other words, three so-called lives were contemplated, but people, when A was copied and made public, got only one. There was, for the author, a continuation to write, and he wrote it later.

7.—I had said that the Visions exist: "That they were written by someone cannot be considered a rash surmise. Of that one we know little, but that little is considerably better than nothing, better than in the case of more than one mediaeval work of value." Mr. Manly asks thereupon: "What of the logical process by which we pass to the assumption that someone is some one?" (p. 13). There is in my sentence no such trickery as Mr. Manly thinks he has discovered: the meaning is, I believe, clear and justifiable enough; and that meaning is, as made evident by the text, that those Visions did not write themselves; and that we know something—not much but yet something—of one, and only one, who is one indeed and not five, judging by all the notes, allusions and references that we possess about him, and which I thereupon enumerate—of one who actually did write the Visions.

<sup>1</sup>P. 7 of my article.

8.—Continuing, Professor Manly writes:

But, says Mr. Jusserand, for the unity of authorship of these poems and for the name of the author, we have abundant evidence. In the first place, "without exception, all those titles" . . . . (etc.). But here, as often, Mr. Jusserand insists upon arguing concerning B and C, when the question at issue concerns the A text. The old habit of regarding A, B, and C as inseparable, even for the purposes of study, is too strong (p. 13).

Rash assertions, lack of method, persistency in following a wrong course: many faults are thus laid at my door. What is there in all these accusations?-Exactly nothing. First, I did not use at all the word "abundant," but I maintain that what we have is much better than nothing, especially as, in my judgment, no evidence of any weight has been, up to now, produced against it. As for the misdeed of arguing about one version when the question at issue concerned another, the inaccuracy of such a statement is easily demonstrable. In that part of my essay, I had been explaining that the complete poem, with the three episodes of Meed, Piers, and Dowel-Dobet-Dobest had been in the author's mind from the first, from the time indeed when he wrote version A, even from the time when he wrote what Professor Manly considers as the first part of A, that is the first eight passus. These three episodes had, from the earliest moment and ever after, formed, I believe, one whole. To show this I first examined, quite apart, p. 7 of my essay, what an inspection of the text of version A had to tell us on this side of the problem; secondly I passed on, p. 8, to a different consideration, viz., to an examination of what bearing the titles, colophons, and marginal notes in whatsoever MSS of the poem, might have on this question and on the question of authorship. The two examinations, the two demonstrations, are quite apart. Professor Manly ignores the first, and coming to the second (about which he says, "In the first place"), declares that I "insist" upon mixing irrelevant questions, "as often," led astray by "the old habit," etc. This way of reasoning is not, I consider, to be commended.

9.—Professor Manly contests (p. 15) that the line:

I have lyved in londe, quod I my name is longe Wille,

—B, XV, 148.

gives us, as a note in MS Laud 581 asserts, "the name of thauctour" (if there was any note of this sort alluding to several authors,

it would not perhaps be treated so lightly, but there is none). He alleges that it might be analogous to the American saying: "I'm from Missouri, you'll have to show me." It is troublesome for him that the same author, as I persist in considering him, who says here, "My name is longe Wille," says elsewhere that he was really and actually "long" of stature: "to long . . . . lowe for to stoupe" (C, VI, 24), which connects him again with the words "longe Wille," used as a surname or nickname to designate him. Mr. Manly has, in any case, to confess that he knows of no "other" example where the words Long Will are taken with the ironical sense he suggests: it is a great pity, because just a second example would have helped us so much to believe in the first.

10.—The value of John Bale's notice concerning Langland is, of course, reduced to a minimum by Professor Manly (p. 16). I know very well that Bale is not infallible; he brings, however, in favour of the system I adhere to, the weight, such as it is, of a learning and love of English letters which were not of the lowest order; and I suppose again, as in the case of the notes in MSS, that if he had made even a vague allusion to the possibility of a multiple authorship, Professor Manly would not have disdained making good use of his statement.

11.—Coming to John But, Professor Manly writes: "John But's continuation, slight as it is, is of importance, because it shows that men did not hesitate to continue or modify a text that came into their hands" (p. 17). One might write just as well: John But's continuation, slight as it is, is of importance because it shows that "men" who wrote a continuation did not hesitate to give their name. Mr. Manly says that But signed "out of vanity;" his four other authors had no vanity and did not sign: they were indeed, in this too, the perfect image of one another.

12.—Concerning the Seven Deadly Sins, I consider that what I said in my section III still holds good. In his desire to show in A certain merits not to be found elsewhere, so that he might conclude the authors of the rest must have been different, Professor Manly had written of the description of the Deadly Sins in A: "Each is sketched with inimitable vividness and brevity." Without insisting

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Cambridge History of English Literature, II, p. 15.

on the question of the brevity of "each" (one of the sins has 76 lines, another 5), I had pointed out that such a statement was quite unfounded, the "inimitably vivid" portrait of Lechery in A being as follows:

Lechour seide 'allas!' and to ur ladi criede
To maken him han merci for his misdede,
Bitwene god almihti and his pore soule,
With-that he schulde the Seterday seven zer after
Drinken bote with the doke and dynen but ones.

-A, V, 54.

While now gainsaying his first statement and admitting that one "may feel regret that we have no such portraits of [Lechour and Sloth] as we have of Envy, Coveitise and Glotoun" (p. 20), Professor Manly maintains that this passage, in which Lechour contents himself with promising, in fact, not to be Glotoun, is not so unsatisfactory after all: "The only other remedies mentioned in the Parson's Tale are continence itself and eschewing the company of the tempter." It cannot but strike Professor Manly himself that, in forgetting this, the author of A, described by him as having such a "capacity for artistic and orderly development" (p. 2) has forgotten the main point, for, if I dare risk an opinion, continence is a better "remedy" for lechery than to drink water on Saturdays. As for the query (p. 20) whether the difference of treatment of the sins, some getting such a masterful portrait as Coveitise or Glotoun, and others receiving such a one as Lechour, is not due to "an artistic purpose" on the part of the author of A, I shall take the liberty of answering nothing.

13.—On the question of the names of the wife and children of Piers, I also adhere to what I formerly said. Mr. Manly objects (p. 22, and cf. p. 10) to my having lightly mentioned those lines in a footnote. I did so because that note was devoted to other examples of the same sort. But I solemnly promise that, if I ever reprint my article, I shall put what I have to say thereon in the text. I shall even show, by at least one more example, how manipulations of an author's manuscript may pass unnoticed by him, without his being two authors. I shall show and confess how this may happen even in our own modern days, even to one who has no less a task

before him than to carry on polemics with Mr. Manly. When the MS of my previous article on the Piers Plowman problem was returned to me with proofs, I found that my text had been submitted to a reader or corrector who had taken with it not a few liberties. As his corrections had been made in red ink in my autograph manuscript, it should have been very easy to re-correct what I did not approve of. But what gave me a shudder and made me think of old Langland, who did not have the same reasons as I to be attentive, is that in one place, the reader had, for reasons known only to himself, carried part of a sentence of mine into a quotation from Piers Plowman. That bit of plain prose had accordingly been printed as verse: it did not alliterate; the red mark of the corrector was very visible in the MS; yet I read my set of proofs twice without noticing the absurdity. On a last reading, I perceived and corrected it. I have preserved the MS, and the sheet is an interesting proof of what not only a "careless scribe" of the middle ages, but an attentive reader of modern times may do, and the interested author twice overlook.

14.—In the discussion concerning the misplaced Robert the Robber passage. I had mentioned that, in order to make it fit somehow the (wrong) place where he put it, the early copyist of A, to whom we owe the mistake, changed the words, "He highte zyuan," which were apparently in the original, into, "And zit I-chulle." Professor Manly does not think the scribe can have done any such thing: "Was Adam [Scrivener] then," he asks, "so sleepy that he could not see that lines 236-41 could not possibly be attached to Sloth, and yet so wide awake that he rewrote the first line?" My answer is that, for changing those three words (not the whole line), the scribe needed not be so very wide awake; while he would have been prodigiously so if he had noticed a misplacing of the whole passage, which escaped the notice of critics for centuries. It may also be recalled that, as Middleton observed, "Fools are not at all hours foolish-no more than wise men wise."

If to move the Robert the Robber passage to its proper place would have been a wonder in a scribe, it would have been, of course, more than natural in the author, when he had once noticed the mistake. Langland noticed it when he wrote his version C and corrected it. Professor Manly does not want him to have done so, and

he alleges (p. 22) that it is, in any case, very extraordinary that he did not do it before, as he had "five" occasions to correct the error-"five I say, and I emphasize it."-Mr. Manly pictures to himself a Langland who must have been (an idea all his own) full of care for the copies of his text; he believes apparently that each time the poet allowed one to be made, he must have carefully re-read his original, and doubtless compared the copy with it, in order to correct any mistake that might have crept into either. In this way would he have lost those five occasions emphasized as before said. But this is, on the part of Mr. Manly, a mere supposition, and the probabilities are quite the other way. The writer who left, in each of his three versions, at least one incorrect list of the Seven Deadly Sins, was not likely to take so much trouble. That he was not the man to read and revise the copies made of his text, is shown besides, not only by the state of the B version, with Robert the Robber left at the wrong place, but by that of the A version too. Mr. Manly recognizes in the author of that version (and he wants to differentiate him thereby from his supposed two or three successors, more addicted to vagaries), a man of "unerring hand," who "never himself forgets for a moment the relations of any incident to his whole plan," etc. This should be the man, if any, to read and revise the copies made of his work. Yet he did not, as in each and all of the numerous MSS we have of A, the Robert the Robber passage is uniformly where it should not be.

If, on the other hand, as noted before, the author had remodeled the Robert the Robber passage when writing version B, as he remodeled innumerable others, and yet, in spite of his having worked at it, had left it at the wrong place, this would have been a strong presumption in favor of the multiple authorship theory. But it so happens that he did nothing of the sort, and the few verbal differences pointed out by Mr. Manly, these "minutiae" as he calls them himself (p. 23), are of the insignificant kind which can be safely referred to the scribe.

15.—I had quoted some examples to show that what had happened to Langland had also happened to others who were unquestionably one man each and not five, and who, besides, were no dreamers and

<sup>1</sup> Cambridge History, II, p. 5.

writers of allegories. Professor Manly makes light of the Roosevelt example. The former President, owing to his use of slips and to his having had two on the same subject, printed twice the same thing on the same page, read several proofs and gave several editions of his work before noticing at last the mistake, unobserved till then by all critics. Professor Manly finds this sort of thing quite intelligible on Mr. Roosevelt's part (p. 23) and quite unbelievable on the part of Langland; a judgment, the reverse of what one would have expected. He points out that, in the case of the American Hunter, there was nothing but a repetition of the same statement—on the same page it may be recalled, so that it should have caught the eye-but yet only a repetition. If Mr. Roosevelt or his printer had allowed, in the second of his parallel statements, "a rhinoceros to stroll into the village of the prairie dogs," he would have noticed the error. According to Mr. Manly, the mistake, uncorrected by Langland in version B of his text (but noticed and corrected in C), is of the rhinoceros kind.

But most obviously it is not, since it remained, as we know, unobserved by printers, critics, and historians for 500 years. If it had been of the rhinoceros type, somebody or other would have noticed it. This increases Mr. Manly's merit in having discovered the mistake, but does not diminish, far from it, the force, value, and appropriateness of the example I quoted.

16.—Another was mentioned by me, Cervantes being the subject thereof. Professor Manly does not accept the interpretation I had given (not on my own authority, but on that of many) of Cervantes' afterthought concerning the theft of Sancho's ass, of how a leaf or slip of his text apparently went astray, and how he failed, though he also had many "occasions" to do so, to set matters straight, and give a plausible text. Mr. Manly prefers the interpretation of the problem given by Mr. Fitzmaurice-Kelly. He is most welcome; I have myself no reason not to prefer it too.

This high authority's account of Cervantes' temper and peculiarities as an author, peculiarities bringing about consequences strangely similar to what we notice in Langland's case, shows that I ought to have insisted rather more than less on this example—

The construction is, of necessity, loose, the proportions unsymmetrical, the incident a farrage of hazard and whim. Written by fits and

starts, in snatches stolen from less congenial work, it has too often an effect of patchiness; over-elaboration and insufficiency of outline are flaunted side by side. The supplementary stories, not all triumphs in themselves, are worked in at random, with no special relevancy. . . . . Chronology, method, accuracy were no hobgoblins of . . . . .

-thus does Mr. Fitzmaurice-Kelly write, not of Langland, but of Cervantes.1 Of the latter he says also, with respect to certain inconsistencies in his text, that, "no doubt, his memory was sometimes at fault." which may well have been the case with Langland, too. Cervantes' intention had first been "to write a short comic story, but the subject mastered him and forced him to enlarge the scope of his original design"—a not unfrequent happening, as shown by Lamartine and his Jocelyn and, as we think, Langland and his Piers Plowman. "It is curious to reflect," Mr. Fitzmaurice-Kelly continues, "that Sancho Panza is himself an afterthought. . . . . So late as the ninth chapter we read of a Sancho with 'long shanks'-a squire inconceivable!" If Sancho was an afterthought, and one imperfectly worked into the text, well may the case have been the same with Robert the Robber too. Though one author and not several, Cervantes offers, here and there, remarkable differences in merit and style: "At his best . . . . he is a perfect, unsurpassable master. . . . . When his attention flags, he sinks at moments into an almost slovenly obscurity."2

Dealing with the incident of the stealing by Gines de Pasamonte of the ass which Sancho is nevertheless found riding immediately after, Mr. Fitzmaurice-Kelly's interpretation is as follows:

It is plain that Cervantes' MS must have contained an account of Gines de Pasamonte's rascality. How this account came to be omitted from the first edition can only be conjectured. . . . . The conception was an afterthought and may well have been written down on a loose sheet of paper which was accidentally lost.

For such things will happen.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>The Historie of Don Quixote . . . . translated by T. Shelton, with Introduction by Fitzmaurice-Kelly, London, 1896, Vol. I, p. xxviii.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Complete Works of Cervantes—Don Quizote—ed. by Fitzmaurice-Kelly, translated by J. Ormsby, Glasgow, 1901, Vol. I, pp. xvi, xxxiii.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>In the first edition there is no account of the stealing of the ass, but we suddenly find Sancho making mournful allusions to his loss of it, as if we knew how it had happened. In the second and following editions figures the passage under discussion, telling of the theft

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., p. xv.

Mr. Fitzmaurice-Kelly thinks that, owing to some mishap of this sort, the first edition appeared, as it did, with two unintelligible allusions to the theft as having taken place, whereas no account of the actual deed had been given. This discrepancy being noticed by the publisher, he caused the gap to be filled by someone who was not Cervantes, and the filling was inserted by mistake at the wrong place, so that Sancho still rides, for some time, the stolen ass (other commentators are of a different opinion and even consider that the addition, which they attribute to the author himself, is of "extraordinary value").

Contemporary critics made fun of the mistake and derided the author. Cervantes was aware of it; he was also proud of his work and of its success (five editions in less than seven months); he had circulated in it MS before it was printed, and we know that he keenly resented the intrusion of a continuator. Yet he let things go, and he cared no more for the copies of his work than Langland did for those of his own; he never gave the right text, he never asked his printer to put at least the interpolation (supposing it to be one) at the right place; and the curious discrepancies in his text were allowed to stay.

Stranger still, when, nine years after the first, he gave his second part, he showed in chapters 3, 4, and 27, that he was aware something was wrong in the first part, and that it had been made fun of by certain people. He offered, by the mouth of Sancho in chapter 4, a half serious, half jocose answer—a very curious answer which shows that, even then, well aware he had been criticised, proud as he was of his work and of its success, ready, as he proved further on, to resent an intruder's tamperings, he had not taken the trouble to ascertain how the passage of his own text which he had to discuss, really stood. His apologetic remarks do not exactly fit any of the versions of the same. The objection he gives himself to answer is that he had forgotten "to say who the thief was who stole Sancho's Dapple, for it is not stated there, but only to be inferred from what is set down, that he was stolen; and a little farther we see Sancho mounted on the same ass without its having turned up."

This cannot apply to the second edition nor to the following ones.

<sup>1</sup> Part ii, chap. 3.

since the passage, said to be interpolated, had been added into them with full explanations as to the stealing of the ass by Gines de Pasamonte mentioned by name. It does not apply any better to the first edition where we gather only, by two passing allusions of Sancho's, that his ass must have been stolen; where there is no account, either of the stealing or the recovery of the animal; and where it is not "a little farther," but much later in the story, that Sancho is actually seen with his ass again. The words "a little farther" fit, on the contrary, very well all the other editions where, ten lines after the account of the theft, we find Sancho "seated sideways, woman fashion, on his ass."

Carelessness, inattention, forgetfulness when his great work was in question; over-elaboration and insufficiency of outline appearing side by side; afterthoughts insufficiently worked into the text; parts that are masterful and others of "an almost slovenly obscurity;" indifference as to the copies or editions of his own text, a misplaced leaf remaining definitively misplaced in spite of all the occasions to correct the error (a publisher who took the trouble of having the gap filled by a third party would have welcomed, at any time, the author's own rectification)—all this and more we find in the case of Cervantes who, in spite of it all, was one single author and not several.

17.—Professor Manly objects (p. 24) to my suggestion that the lines C, IX, 84–91 are one more example of a misplaced passage. I expressed the opinion that this added speech of Piers must have, in reality, made part of his address to the Knight. Professor Manly thinks that it should stay where it is, and must be directed to Piers's own son. But Piers's son is not supposed to be present at all, only his name being given in the sort of parenthesis inserted into the Plowman's speech. As for the "unlikelihood that," as Mr. Manly says, "the peasant Piers would assume this tone with the Knight and call him 'dere sone'" (p. 25), it is scarcely necessary to recall that Piers, far from appearing there as a "peasant" pure and simple, had been given by the poet the part of leader, and had undertaken to show to all classes of society the way to truth, the Knight having personally acknowledged the old man's leadership.

<sup>1</sup> Part i, chap. 23.

18.—"Furthermore," Professor Manly continues, "if Mr. Jusserand accepts Professor Skeat's view that MS Laud 581 was corrected by the author himself, or perhaps indeed his own autograph, it is worth observing . . . . " (p. 26). No conclusion whatever should be drawn from such a surmise, restated more than once; I certainly never said a word in my article implying that I adhered to a hypothesis which, I believe, Professor Skeat does not himself adhere to any more.

19.—What I said on the Robert the Robber passage. on its being rightly put, in C, at the place where it belonged from the first, on the "much lauded Welshman" (why "much lauded," and what does that mean?), I strictly maintain; let the reader weigh the evidence. I certainly fail to see that C, as Professor Manly contends, far from improving the text, changed, at the beginning of the passage, a simple and grammatical sentence into a monster "neither the flesh of a name nor the fish of a promise, a ghastly amphibian," etc., (p. 27). C, we are asked to believe, removed the Robber passage from a place where it made nonsense, only to put it at another where it does not fit, just what could be expected from one who was not the original author and knew no better. C, moreover, introduced in the first description of the sins (B, V; C, vii) a number of passages borrowed from other parts of text B, "And it seems clear that C had no better reason for his transfer of the Robber passage than for his transfer of the others" (p. 28). In other words, he had no good reason for either, he acted arbitrarily (not to say nonsensically): what else could be expected, since he was not the original author?-But he was, and acted quite sensibly, having excellent reasons in both cases for doing what he did, namely, putting the Robber passage at a place which is, I maintain, the only one for which it can have been written, and for suppressing, by the other changes, one of the descriptions of the Deadly Sins (the one in B. XIII, spots on the coat of Haukyn), two of them being fused into one. Langland felt. when writing C, and this is a not unique proof of good taste given by him when making this revision, that those descriptions were too numerous and that one could disappear with advantage.

20.—Speaking of the "much lauded Welshman," Zyvan Zeld-azeyn,

<sup>1</sup> Section III of my previous article, pp. 14 ff.

otherwise Reddite, Professor Manly contests the identification which I proposed of the two, though the text itself makes it plain. I had pointed out that this peculiar device (an abstract Latin word figuring also in the poem as a live being) was not used by Langland in this place only, and that what we find here in C, we had found before in A, even in what Professor Manly considers as the first part of A, the work of the earliest of his four authors. On this he offers no remark.

21.—Professor Manly having, like many before him, noticed the absence of Wrath in the description of the Seven Deadly Sins in A, V, drew from this conclusions of considerable magnitude. It seemed to him that to forget one of the sins was an impossibility; the author of the first part of A especially, that precise mind who has, he thinks, "definiteness" for his characteristic and is described as so different from B, who is incapable of "consecutive thinking," cannot possibly have made such an omission. He must have written a description of Wrath, but it must have been lost, and the lost half-leaf must have been the counterpart of another half-leaf where the poet must have written a long passage (long indeed it must have been) to properly connect the confession of Sloth with that of a thief.

Langland himself supplies the answer, for he did not omit Wrath in one list of the Seven Sins in A, but in two; so that, whatever may be the case with others, such omissions were certainly possible to him, and this is enough to seriously shake our belief in the lost half-leaf; for the poet really *could* forget a sin.

More than that, as I pointed out, what took place in the B and C revisions is, so far as it goes, evidence of a single and not a multiple authorship. This omission of one of the sins, by an author giving a description of them, "incredible" says Professor Manly (p. 31), nearly impossible as it is, is yet made in his turn by the author of B just as by the author of A, and by that of C just as by that of B; which reveals a strange similarity in the foibles of Professor Manly's "several men of notable intellectual power." This neither he, nor anyone, I believe, had ever observed. Yet it is a fact that B, while he notices the absence of Wrath and adds him in the two places where he was missing in A, when he has to draw up one more list himself, draws

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>P. 23 of my article.

it wrong, forgetting Envy. C leaves this same list incomplete, with Envy still lacking. The more "incredible" such doings, the more symptomatic of a unique authorship.

Let the reader value as he may think fit the explanation now offered by Professor Manly. His explanation is that such omissions, so extraordinary in A as to justify, he considers, the belief in a hypothetical lost leaf, are very natural when B is in question. Better still, they were purposely made, they were made for "some particular reason," for a reason "not hard to discover" (p. 30), and that reason is one of art and logic: an unexpected reason, to say the least, when we remember Mr. Manly's denunciation of B's "incapacity for organized and consecutive thinking," and his "tendency to rambling and vagueness," especially "in the third vision," the one presently under consideration. Anyhow, Professor Manly's reason "not hard to discover" is to the effect that the author there enumerates the Deadly Sins, just to show that Poverty is not liable to them, and that Envy is appropriately omitted because Poverty cannot be considered as immune from it. But, if the reason imagined by Professor Manly were accepted (to the great credit of B's capacity for "organized and consecutive thinking"), Wrath should have been omitted as well as Envy, for Poverty is as liable to the one as to the other. For what cause, besides, just before they draw up their incomplete list, B as well as C is careful to point out that they are presently dealing with the 'sevene synnes that there ben" (B, XIV, 201), and to repeat once more that the "sevene synnes" are their theme (B, XIV, 218), Mr. Manly no less carefully abstains from explaining.

My own explanation, if I may venture one, is that Langland *could* omit sins in his lists, and that the three versions are by him.

22.—On the respective merits of the portrait of Wrath added by B (so unsatisfactory, according to Professor Manly, as to denote a different author) and of the portraits of the sins in A, I cannot but repeat what I said, and what I said was to the effect that, when Professor Manly stated that, in A, each sin was sketched "with inimitable vividness," he misstated the case. Let anyone who doubts read again, for example, the sketch of Lechour quoted above (remark 12). Wrath is certainly not more unsatisfactory in B than some

<sup>1</sup> Cambridge History, pp. 23, 24.

others in A, and it is difficult to understand how Professor Manly can allege that, in A, "Lechour is the lecherous man," while, in B, Wrath (represented "with two whyte eyen, and nyvelynge with the nose, and his nekke hangynge") is "in no sense the wrathful man" (p. 33). Both descriptions should be read together, without forgetting that I have shown that those attributes of Wrath in B, which Professor Manly had chosen to consider so very irrelevant, are, on the contrary, the usual, commonplace, classical ones, given to that sin by the mediaeval manuals of greatest authority. Professor Manly pretends that I "tried to answer his charge" by saying "that Envy and Wrath are so much alike that B cannot justly be criticized for giving us a portrait of Envy and labeling it Wrath" (p. 32). Yet, in spite of what Mr. Manly writes there, and repeats, p. 33, I never committed myself in such grave matters; I never presumed to say that Envy and Wrath are either alike or different; I only did what I supposed was right: I quoted contemporary texts giving what was then the accepted opinion, of more importance on those questions than mine or that of Professor Manly. I quoted some lines from the Parson's Tale, and might have quoted many more to the same effect, those, for example, where the Parson declares that there are three sources for "Ira," namely Pride, Envy, "and thanne stant the sinne of contumelie or stryf and cheeste," on which Chaucer's Ira "stryveth eek alday agayn precisely B insists. trouthe"—"lesynges I ymped," says Langland's Wrath in B (V, 138).

23.—Professor Manly's remark that, if there is a great difference of style between the Parson's tale and the Miller's (the author being nevertheless only one man), the cause must be that Chaucer was influenced by his original (p. 34), does not destroy my argument. It shows that, under certain influences, an author may use very different styles, and yet continue to be one and not several; those influences may come, not only from a difference of original, but a difference of time, disposition, and subject.

24.—The question of the supposed mistakes or failures to understand their supposed predecessors, attributed by Professor Manly to his several authors, is by him studied again. I persevere in my views, and referring the reader to the article in which I have developed them, I shall only offer the following observations:

In B. Professor Manly had said, "Lewte is introduced as the leman of the Lady Holy Church and spoken of as feminine." My answer, I deem, holds good: Leman meaning a "tenderly loved being of either sex," I do not see why Mrs. Lewte would not be for Lady Holy Church, just as well as Mr. Lewte would have been, a leman, or tenderly loved being. I maintain also that the only proof of B having made of Lewte a feminine personage is that, at one place, we read "hire" instead of "him," and that this is in truth no proof at all. Professor Manly cannot reconcile himself to the thought that a scribe may have been guilty of such a blunder-consisting in the change of one letter (and corrected in C). Since the change creates, according to him, nonsense, he considers that it must necessarily come from the author! To "relieve" the author of the responsibility arbitrarily laid thus on his shoulders, Mr. Manly wants "something in the text to indicate that 'hire' is a scribe's error" (p. 35). I make bold to say that this is asking too much.

25.—Professor Manly had said also, in order so show that we had to do with several authors, that in B, "Fals instead of Wrong is father of Meed, but is made to marry [i. e. to prepare to marry] her later." I continue to think that, here too, B is not guilty, and that the passage was improved, not spoiled, by him. If Wrong was to be at all the father, he should have been made to play a more important part than he does in A, where, so long as the marriage is in question, he does nothing, but awakens from his torpor later in a completely different episode (IV, 47 ff.) in which he entirely ceases to be alluded to as the father of Meed, though Meed is present and plays also a part in the incident: all this, in that A text, the work, we are told, of a man of "unerring hand," who "never himself forgets for an instant the relation of any incident to his whole plan." No less than B and C, A was fallible.

It may be observed, on the other hand, that, according to Professor Manly, Meed was such "a desirable bride" that her father did not need to do anything in order to secure a husband for her: hence, we are told, his inactivity; the same authority finds, however, quite natural that a portion be nevertheless provided for her, not by her father, but by a friend. It seems to me that B followed the

<sup>1</sup> Cambridge History, p. 5.

dictates of common sense in suppressing useless Wrong in this episode and in giving Favel for both a father and portion-provider to Meed.

As for Fals having been written at one place for Favel in B, I pointed out that similar slips of the pen occur at different places in the three texts. Mr. Manly ironically insists, as usual, on that "most troublesome person" the scribe, on that "careless or meddlesome scribe," so as to give the impression that I attribute too much to copyists. But such is not the case, and besides I do not do it to the extent he is pleased to say. In this case, in particular, I did not attribute the blunders in question specifically and exclusively to the scribe, and Mr. Manly might have remembered that what I wrote was: "Such slips of the pen would have been difficult for any copyist and even for any author to avoid, in such a passage as this, with so many lines alliterating in f, and Favel fair speech, and Fals fickle tongue constantly succeeding one another" (p. 34 of my article). The same might very well happen also to more than one of us, and I could quote as many examples as might be deemed necessary.

26.—I shall not continue further the discussion of the supposed misdeeds of B, but shall only state that I persist in pleading not guilty for him all along the line, being unable to understand how, for example, Professor Manly can seriously ask "whether any student of Piers Plowman ever clearly recognized that [the] feoffment (in B, II, 74 ff) is intended to cover 'precisely the provinces of the Seven Deadly Sins,' before acquaintance with the simpler form of the A text enabled him to perceive the plan overlaid by the elaborations of B and C" (p. 39). The so-called "elaborations" which "overlay" the original plan, fill, all told, ten lines more in B than in A; and B can even claim that he has a right to more room than was used before, as the "simpler form of the A text" was really too simple, one of the sins having been forgotten in that version.

27.—On questions of dialect and versification, Professor Manly asks us to wait; let us. It cannot be unfair, however to note, in the meanwhile, that Miss Mary Deakin's study of the *Alliteration in Piers Plowman* has led her to the conclusion that, to all appearances, "the alliteration gives no support to Professor Manly's theory."

<sup>1</sup> Modern Language Review, July, 1909, p. 483.

28.—On the difference in merit between A. B. and C. denoting four different authorships, Professor Manly protests (p. 44) that he never said that the "first part of A was the best in the whole work." If I mistook his meaning, I am sorry. I may, however, recall that, after having written the words just mentioned, I quoted the very expressions used by him, at different places, in praise of the first part of A, and which had given me, and may have given others, the impression he objects to.1 The fact has, however, no importance, as the discussion bore only on those specific qualities recognized by Professor Manly in A and which he fails to find in the supposed authors of B and C, concluding that they must be different people. I think I have shown that those differences were not at all what Professor Manly wanted us to believe, and, in particular, that what he told us of A's "unity of structure and art of composition," of the author never forgetting "for a moment the relation of any incident to his whole plan," of his superiority in this respect to B, who is incapable of "consecutive thinking" and with whom "topics alien to the main theme intrude because of the use of a suggestive word," is entirely unacceptable. I have given, I consider, glaring examples of A's aptitude for vagaries; my judgment on this propensity of his being, if anything, too indulgent. Let anyone read the original passage which I summed up in my first example, and say whether the explanation, by Lady Holy Church, of the field full of folk is at all satisfactory and answers, in any way, our ideas of sound texture. I showed, I believe, that what the lady had to explain was not hard to make clear, and would have been made so but for A's disposition to wander. Professor Manly takes exception to my having quoted the MS of the Valenciennes Passion (p. 45). I quoted it because it is the best known and oftenest reproduced. I shall not go into a discussion of the similar arrangement of the mansions of a mediaeval stage in England and in France, and shall simply recall that the scene to be described was plain and familiar enough: if we have no English MS showing such a mystery-play in action, pictures of the same scenes, with God's tower and the devil's "dungun," were to be seen in a number of churches (Shakespeare could see one in his youth at Stratford, a certainly English town) and were familiar to the many.

<sup>1</sup>P. 39 of my article.

Professor Manly asserts, it is true, that my account of the passage is inadequate and unsatisfactory. I do not think that his is perfect, either. But take the original, and you cannot fail to find that A does exactly what B is accused by Professor Manly of doing—and accused in view of proving that the author must have been a different man: a "suggestive word" makes him treat of a "topic alien to the main theme." The main theme was the two castles and the field full of folk, and the topic on which A insists most is drunkenness.

I had quoted, pp. 41 and 42, n. 1, several other examples of incoherence, instead of "structural excellence", in A; Professor Manly mentions only this one and says nothing of the others, so it is perhaps needless to add that I might have quoted, and that anyone may find, as many more as may be wanted. We had been told of differences between A and B, and we find similitudes.

29.—Wanting to show, from another point of view, more differences between A, B, and C, Professor Manly had said, after he had discussed the first vision: "Only once or twice does the author interrupt his narrative to express his own views and feelings." I had thought, wrongly as it turns out, that the first part of A was meant, and I had pointed out five examples of such interruptions instead of "one or two." But Professor Manly's remark, of very moderate scope indeed, applied, I see (p. 46), only to the first half of the first half of A. It remains, however, that this device was resorted to in very appreciable fashion by the author of A—of the first part of A—and that the increase in the number of such cases in B and C is more apparent than real, since the bulk of the poem was considerably increased, too, in these versions: 7241 lines in B, against 2579 in A.

30.—Professor Manly cannot conceive that an author having written a fine line, or a fine passage, or a fine poem in his youth, may spoil it or leave it out in his later years. If such spoilings or discardings are discovered, then, he thinks, two different men must have been at work. He quotes two such examples from version C: one is the fine line in A and B, "Percen with a pater noster" (which he deems to be only a translation of Brevis oratio penetrat caelum: it is luckily much more); the line is certainly spoilt in C, and spoilt to such an extent as to be meaningless, so that we may well doubt we have the real text, whether it be by Langland or by somebody else. The

other is the splendid appeal to God: "Ac pore peple thi prisoneres," which C omits altogether; Mr. Manly exclaims thereupon: "Would you not expect the man who had written those lines to preserve them? . . . . Would you not really?" (p. 48).

The fact is that men are not the simple, logical and once-for-all individuals Mr. Manly fancies them to be, and the expectation he so fervidly expresses is doomed to be defeated, not by Langland alone, but by a number of poets and prosators of all times and countries, one man each of them, not four. Would you not expect the poet who had written the beautiful sonnet:

Je veux lire en trois jours l'Iliade d'Homère,

to preserve it? Yet Ronsard left it out of his works and never reproduced it in any edition of his writings, after 1560.

Would you not expect the man who had become famous by his strambotti, and had rendered poems of that kind fashionable, to preserve his? Yet Chariteo, whose reputation rested on such writings, having printed them in 1506, suppressed them in his works after 1509.

Would you not expect the man who had written the splendid sentences on music, on the stairway of the Vatican, on the Tiber and the Roman campagna, just published by the Revue d'Histoire Littéraire de la France, to preserve them? Shakespeare did not, every day, write better. Yet Châteaubriand left them among discarded fragments of the Mémoires d'Outre Tombe, and they remained unprinted till now.

Mr. Christian Maréchal has pointed out, in his before-quoted work, a number of passages in which Lamartine replaced admirable lines to be found in the early versions of his *Jocelyn* by more commonplace ones, or discarded them altogether.<sup>2</sup> Yet again all those men were

l'Revue d'Histoire Littéraire de la France, two [articles by A. Feugère, April and September, 1909, pp. 584, 585, 589. Here are two of those sentences: "Je vais saluer Léon XII après avoir traversé la magnifique place de Saint-Pierre; je monte avec une émotion toujours nouvelle le grand escalier désert du Vatican, foulé par tant de pas effacés et d'où descendirent tant de fois les destinées du monde."—"Je me perdais dans ces sentiments indécis que fait naître la musique, art qui tient le milieu entre la nature matérielle et la nature intellectuelle, qui peut dépouiller l'amour de son enveloppe terrestre ou donner un corps à l'ange du ciel. Selon les dispositions de celui qui les écoute, ces mélodies sont des pensées ou des caresses."

 $<sup>^2</sup>$  Josselin inédit, 1909, pp. lvii, lxiii, xcvi, xcvii, xcviii ff. Some of those fine lines, Mr. Maréchal writes, "Lamartine les a sacrifiés sans regret, mais nous ne saurions accepter d'un coeur aussi léger un pareil sacrifice," p. xcvii.

essentially artists (while Langland was not), that is, men who, if any, would have preserved the artistic products of their pen. Time and again they did not: much more could Langland act likewise, without Professor Manly being justified in cutting him into pieces.

Add thereto, that when we come to think of the hypothesis Professor Manly wants us to accept, of a new author freely remodeling another's work, of a new author who is a "sincere man," who is a man of "notable intellectual power" (and no less can be said of the poet who wrote the touching melancholy addition at the beginning of passus vi in C, the picturesque and realistic portraits of the lollers and sham hermits, etc.), we are free to think that those spoilings or discardings are scarcely less surprising on the part of such a supposed reviser than on the part of the author, and we might say, in our turn: Would you not expect such a reviser, finding those lines, to preserve them? . . . . Would you not really?

31.—I continue unable to agree with Professor Manly on the question of the pardon granted to Piers, the only sort of pardon to fit such a being, one with the grandest and noblest import, not one certainly to be torn to pieces by that high-souled leader. The tearing to pieces is suppressed in C, to the immense advantage of the scene and dismay of Professor Manly, whose system does not apparently allow him to permit the author of C to act so well. He considers, therefore (p. 48), that it is quite natural for Piers, in B, and also in A, to destroy, out of spite, or, as Mr. Manly prefers to say, "out of grief and disappointment," the scroll giving him and his followers their rule of life—out of grief and disappointment, because he is shown by a priest of the vulgar-minded sort, by a "lewede lorel," that his bill contains the noblest precept, and is not one of those pardons which despicable pardoners "gaf for pans." Piers to be "disappointed" at that!

In A and B the passage is absolutely unintelligible and inconsistent, to the point of being a serious blemish in those versions. C immensely improved it, and in more ways than one: in the A version the pardon was twice said to have been procured from the pope, which did not fit with what followed; B suppressed one of the irrelevant allusions to the pope, and C suppressed both.

<sup>1</sup> A, VIII, 123.

To further diminish C's merit, Professor Manly accuses the poet of having badly joined together what he left after he had suppressed the inacceptable tearing of the scroll and suppressed also the rambling speech delivered thereupon by Piers in A (for rambling speeches, sad to say, are to be found in A, too). Well may the fault be contested, but it is of small consequence. Supposing the case to be as we are told, Langland's more or less clever joining together of the two rims of the gap left by his removal of the obnoxious passage is of very little import: of such sins he was certainly capable. The removal of the lines is, on the contrary, of great import, as it leaves to Piers his true character, and makes of the whole scene one of the grandest in the poem.

32.—Professor Manly would "also like to know the meaning of B, VII, 168 (C, X, 318) . . . . B and C apparently thought 'preost' was the subject of 'divinede,' whereas the subject is, of course, 'I,' implied in 'me' of l. 152" (p. 49).

The truth is that the passage is not clear, logical or grammatical in either of the three texts, and we all wish it were the only one of that sort in Langland. The author of C, whether Langland, as I believe, or a reviser, as Mr. Manly thinks, cannot certainly have meant that, according to the priest, "Dowel indulgences passede," since this was bound to be Piers's and not the priest's opinion; and the poet was as fully aware of it when writing C as when composing A and B, since, a few lines before, he had recalled, in this last version, the opposition of views between the two men, and how "the preest inpugned" the "pardon Peers hadde" (C, X, 300), and since, moreover, C is the only text where the episode is given its full value.

Though I know how unwilling Professor Manly is to admit that the original copyist may have been so inordinately clumsy as to mistake two or three letters, I am tempted to suggest that very possibly, while the copies we have of C read: "And how the preest prevede," the

The preest thus and Perkyn' of the pardon jangled (C, X, 292),

<sup>1</sup> All the reasoning is founded on the line,

<sup>&</sup>quot;which is nonsense," says Mr. Manly, "after the suppression of the jangling" (p. 48). But the opposition between the views of the priest and those Piers must have entertained, may have been thought by the author to be sufficiently indicated by the priest's remark "Ich can no pardon fynde," and to justify the allusion to the jangling. Very possibly, however, the original text did not read thus, but tho (then), which gave the line a clear and unimpeachable meaning.

original read: "And how that peers prevede" (C, X, 318). If this is considered too bold, I would answer that it is not more so than to suppose, as Professor Manly does, that in A (whose logic must be saved at all costs, though it cannot be saved after the tearing of the "pardon" by Piers), "I" is "of course" implied by "me" of l. 152. The whole passage in A is as follows—and, as Langland would have said, let anyone who can "construe this on Englisch":

Al this maketh me' on metels to thenken

Mony tyme at midniht' whon men schulde slepe,

On Pers the plouh-mon' and whuch a pardoun he hedde,

And hou the preost inpugnede hit' al bi pure resoun,

And divinede that Dowel' indulgence passede.

-A. VIII. 152.

33.—To Professor Manly's "great surprise" (p. 49), I refused to find any failure of C to understand B, when the former modified the passage about the belling of the cat.

At the risk of still increasing Professor Manly's surprise, I emphatically persist in my way of thinking, and deem that C deserves praise, not blame. I persist in considering that in B, the passage was unsatisfactory: in which passage the well-spoken rat describes certain "segges" or beings—by which he means dogs, I fully agree in this with Mr. Manly, everybody does, and the point is not under discussion—who are to be seen in "the cite of London," who bear about their necks bright collars of crafty work, and who go "uncoupled" in "wareine and in waste." If they bore a bell on their collars,

Men myste wite where thei went and awei renne.

-B. Prol., 166.

This is certainly a clumsy speech. The "segges" being dogs in B, and obviously sporting dogs, whom their masters uncouple to use them in warrens, how can we imagine that, if they had a bell on their necks, men would know where they go, and "away run!" In this part of his speech, B's rat seems to me, I confess, a very silly rat.

C's changes are quite sensible and to his credit. Far from showing a "failure to understand" the earlier version and helping us to believe in a quadruple authorship, they lead the other way. The author deliberately drops all the allusions to dogs, as they fitted

imperfectly his purpose; he suppresses the mention of the uncoupling, the warren, etc., and replaces the whole by a very clear and pointed allusion to actual men and to actual customs prevailing then in England. "But this is a beast fable," Professor Manly exclaims; "what have men to do in it, among the rats and mice? . . . And above all, why the warrens and the waste? Do men run uncoupled in rabbit warrens and waste fields?" But C does not say that they do, and is grievously misrepresented here by Professor Manly. As evidenced, on the other hand, by numberless examples, from the days of Æsop to those of Langland, in a "beast fable,"men are not necessarily ignored; a rat is not bound to allude only to animals, and may just as well, like the swallow in Æsop's fine fable of the Swallow and Birds, allude to men, especially if the meaning is to be made clearer thereby. And such is the case here, C's rearrangement being as follows:

Ich have yseie grete syres' in citees and in tounes
Bere byžes of bryžt gold' al aboute hure neckes,
And colers of crafty werke' bothe knyžtes and squiers.
Were ther a belle on hure byže' by Jesus, as me thynketh,
Men myžte wite wher thei wenten' and hure way roume.
Ryžt so (etc.)
—C, Prol., 177.

34.—Passing to the personal notes to be found in the Visions and which, I consider, point to a unity of authorship, Professor Manly, in order to minimize their importance, declares that they are, "in reality, singularly few" (p. 54). They are, in reality, singularly numerous: we must remember the period when *Piers Plowman* was written, and I should like to know what are the poems in comparison with which the personal notes in the Visions can be described as being, in reality, singularly few.

As to localities, Professor Manly says that "the Malvern hills are no doubt a locality with which A1 had special associations of some sort, but they have apparently no special significance for the other writers" (p. 53). It should be observed, in this respect, that C not only preserved all those allusions supposed to be for him without special significance, but increased their number by one. After the added passage at the beginning of passus vi, where the author considers his past life, thinks of his childhood, of his father, of his friends

of former days, the name of Malvern recurs to his mind and he tells us that he now resumes the dreams he had dreamed on those same hills:

Thenne mette me moche more than ich by-fore tolde Of the mater that ich mette fyrst on Malverne hulles.

-C, VI, 109.

The counterpart of the first of these lines but not of the second is to be found in versions A and B.

35.—As to the author's sayings about himself, his youth, his disappointments, his way of living, Professor Manly persists in fancying that all this must be fancy: but that is, on his part, mere guessing. I have recalled how certain recent discoveries show that some prudence should be used in forming hypotheses of this sort, and that poets were, in such cases, guided by their memory and not by their imagination oftener than latter-day critics would have us to believe. To the examples I have given, more than one might be added, selected from various times and countries, for men will resemble men, poets will resemble poets.¹

36.—Professor Manly insists that, given their names, Kitte and Kalote must have been dissolute women (p. 55) in spite of my having pointed out that this interpretation of the words would be as untenable in the case of a reviser as in that of the original author, since the passage, very beautiful in itself, would thus become absurd if not repugnant. He answers nothing to what I have said and shown, that before such names become definitively opprobrious, there is a long period when they are used both ways.<sup>2</sup> Mr. Manly, who comes forth with a theory of his own, rejecting the usual ideas on the subject and replacing them by an interpretation which causes the passage to be, in spite of what he alleges, meaningless, has done nothing to show that, for those names, such a period was past, and that the meaning cannot but have been shameful.

37.—I never desired to hold Professor Manly "responsible for every phrase of Professor Jack's article" (p. 56). I simply quoted Mr. Manly himself, according to whom Mr. Jack had "conclusively proved"

¹ This example, for instance. Studying Lamartine's famous novel of Raphael, Mr Léon Séché writes thus: "Chose remarquable et que les incrédules d'hier sont bien forcés de reconnaître aujourd'hui, Lamartine n'ra rien inventé dans ce roman ou pas grand chose. C'est tout au plus si, par endroits, il a interverti l'ordre chronologique des faits et les quelques inexactitudes qu'on y relève sont plutôt attribuables à l'infidélité de sa mémoire."—Revue Hebdomadaire, Oct. 3, 1908, p. 31.

<sup>2 &</sup>quot;Péronnelle" is another example of a feminine name remaining, for a long time, an honorable one, and then coming, by degrees, to be used disparagingly.

that the "supposed autobiographical details" in the poem were merely part of the fiction. I showed that the latter had "conclusively proved" nothing of the kind, and given what he had to concede in the end, he could not himself pretend that he had. I continue to believe that, so long as no positive text or fact contradicts the plain statements in the poem (and no such has been adduced), we are entitled to take them for what they are given.

#### III

At certain places in his article, Professor Manly pays me some compliments which I should be most happy to merit, and some others which, I hope, I do not deserve. He attributes to me an "eloquence" and "dexterity" which, since he, for his part, repudiates all such, I hope I am not afflicted with: the success he looks forward to, he tells us, for his own argumentation is "not a success of dialectical dexterity, but of sound reasoning" (pp. 1, 2).

I hope some sound reasoning may be found in my article, too.

At the end of his reply, Professor Manly begs his reader not to forget that, on my road, "many of the bridges which are fairest in outward seeming are really unsafe structures with a crumbling keystone; that pitfalls lie concealed beneath some of the most attractive stretches . . . ." etc., and that, if he allows himself to be carried away by my eloquence, he will have "to turn back and seek painfully the plain highway," regretting to have abandoned it "for the soft but dangerous by-paths" to which I had lured him.

I had no idea that I had thus played the part of a land siren, attracting unwary travelers to dangerous regions. I thought, in fact, that I had done nothing, from the first, but defend old, plain, commonly accepted ideas, and follow the trodden way and most people's road, having chosen the most inglorious and unfashionable task. I did so, not out of abnegation, but simply because those ideas, in my judgment, were the sounder, and had been attacked without just motives. And I beg, in my turn, the reader to be assured that it was not in "soft but dangerous by-paths" that I found cause for the belief in which I persist, that "William Langland made Pers Ploughman."

J. J. JUSSERAND

SAINT HAON-LE-CHÂTEL August, 1909

# THE MISPLACED LINES, PIERS PLOWMAN (A) V, 236-41

In the July number of *Modern Philology* (p. 61) Professor Manly dismisses rather summarily my suggestion (in the *Modern Language Review*, October, 1908, p. 1), repeated independently by Professor Brown, that the importunate passage belongs to the confession of Robert the Robber. "If Robert had not 'wherwith,'" he urges, "of what avail would be his conditional promise of restitution?"

It is true the language of the interpolated passage is not quite consistent with the original confession. In that, Robert is made to say that he had "noght wherof," and despaired of gaining the means of restitution. Here, he expresses his willingness to "velde again." and seems confident of being able to do so. Nav more, he anticipates a "residue and a remnaunt," out of which he hopes to defray the expenses of a pilgrimage to Rome. All this would perhaps better fit Coveitise-whose ill-gotten gains form the main subject of that sinner's confession. But there is no place for it there. Is it not worth considering whether the lines in question may not be a kind of afterthought-prompted by a sense of the grave defect of penitence unaccompanied by works meet thereto? The Robber may learn to make an honest livelihood, and then not only "restitution" but even a pilgrimage may become possible. This is to some extent supported by what follows about his "leping over land" with his "polished pike."

Anyhow the lines in question are no more fitted to form part of the confession of Wrath than of that of Sloth. To what confession then do they belong? The rest of the Seven Deadly Sins have already been treated. Moreover they distinctly deal with the sin of dishonesty, the two main forms of which are (1) dishonest trading and (2) theft with violence or robbery. The former of these has been fully disposed of under Coveitise; there remains only the latter, exemplified in Robert, to whose confession I have suggested they may be regarded as an addition.

The supposition of a lost leaf is not perhaps in itself improbable. Unfortunately it leaves the lines in question still altogether unexplained. Each of the Sins has so far been represented by a single penitent; it is altogether improbable that the sin of dishonesty—a manifestation of the deadly inner principle of Coveitise—should have claimed two. This fag-end of a confession is thus left wholly without probable attachment!

Perhaps another solution of the problem is possible. If we accept the story of the early death of the author of the Vision, as told in Pass. xii (Skeat)—which Dr. Skeat, holding strongly the one-author theory, is led to regard as emblematical only—we may perhaps look upon the misplacement as simply due to unskilful editing. The author may have left the passage in a detached form, intending to incorporate it, with due adjustment, in the confession either of the Robber or of Coveitise, when he was suddenly struck down by "fever"—perhaps the plague. Supposing this to have been the case, it would be no matter for surprise if a perplexed editor should have dumped it down in a place where its irrelevance is not at once apparent.

THEOPHILUS D. HALL

University College London

#### THE MEDIAEVAL MIMUS

#### PART I

Historians of literature generally assign the parentage of the mediaeval minstrel—spielmann, troubadour, and trouvère—to the Roman mimus. I do not. I propose to examine the literary records of the so-called Dark Ages in Europe, to show that the living poetry of this time did not derive from the Roman mimus either directly or indirectly, that it was rather the instinctive and native art of its own day. Before we move a foot, however, it is necessary to define the word mimus. As used by critics it means three things:

1. A dramatic performance popular in Rome until the fall of the empire.

 Any sort of realistic imitation of life—skit, dance, poem, song, juggling, pantomime, acrobatic feat, trained animals—in short, Roman vaudeville.

3. A Roman vaudeville artist or entertainer.

It is absolutely useless to speak of mimus as the source of mediaeval minstrelsy unless we know at each step just what is meant by mimus. First then let us find out what we may about it.

#### 1. Mimus: Dramatic Performance

There are three types of mimus which are sometimes considered dramatic: (a) Mimic Drama, the sole remnant of which is perhaps No. 413 in the Oxyrhynchus papyrus; '(b) Sung Mimus, the sole remnant of which is perhaps the "erotic fragment" of Grenfell, which Wilamowitz reconstructed and called the "Maid's Lament;" (c) Recited Mimus, like those of Sophron, Herodas, and Theoritus (especially Nos. ii, xiv, xv).

<sup>1</sup> Edd. Grenfell-Hunt, Part iii (1903); cf. Winter, De mimis oxyrhynchis (1906), dissertation.

<sup>2</sup> Göttinger Nachrichten (1896), pp. 209 ff.; cf. also Leo, "Die Plautinischen cantica und die hellenistische Lyrik," Göttinger Abhandlungen (1897); "Die Komposition der Chorlieder Senecas," Rheinisches Museum (1897), pp. 509 ff., and "Der Monolog im Drama," Göttinger Abhandlungen (1908), p. 117.

 $^3$  The mimes of Herodas [or Herondas] are now available in Sharpley's excellent verse-translation A Realist of the Aegean (1906).

3291

4

[MODERN PHILOLOGY, January, 1910

Of these three types of mimus, however, no one is necessarily or even presumably a dramatic performance.<sup>1</sup> There is no reason why the confused enthusiasm of Reich<sup>2</sup> or the fluent narrative of Chambers<sup>3</sup> or any evidence which we as yet possess should lead us

¹ Wilamowitz says (Hermes, Vol. XXXIV [1899], pp. 207 f.): "What are the mimes? Surely no dramatic type. The narrator makes his appearance either in the market-place or in a private dwelling, later in the place which is called 'theater' [schauplatz], because everything an audience wants to see can be better viewed there. The narrator can be just as well compared with the γελωτοποιοί of the West as he can with the aristocratic rhapsodists of the East, who likewise recited pieces of Archilochos and Hipponax. He imitates with drastic comic effect various voices, as is demanded by the dramatic action of his narrative, but in antiquity it was never forgotten that the heroic epic itself belonged to the γένοι μεωτών, and the iambus offered the like alternation of voices. Theoritus' 'Adoniazusai' and 'Simaitha' were surely recited first by him. That is no bookpoetry; of course he was not writing a book. And in the same way Herodas imitated him in the iambus. Whether a single speaker appears, as in his Keeper of the Brothel, or quite a number, as in his 'Asklepiazusai,' that is all one. God forgive those who believe this sort of thing was really played!"

Sudhaus is equally decided (Hermes, Vol. XLI, pp. 269 f.): "A pronounced conservative tendency and a clarity as to the requisites and aims of their art enabled the mimes to remain what they were, and prevented their merging with the higher drama. As numerous utterances prove, the mime was always conscious that his main task was character portrayal. Doubtless for the entertainment of audiences he did play comedy, produce spectacular pieces, and give such farces as the Charition of Oxyrhynchos, which might be termed a scurrilous Iphigenia but no longer a real mime. He never forgot, however, that ἡθοποιία and the picture of life was his true field, and our piece (Oxyrhynchus 413) shows us how, despite a comprehensive action, the whole object of a mime could be made the sustaining of a single character, rôle. If one lays aside pure jugglery and the low types of mimesis, the mime is nothing but ἡθοποιία. It is no drama, for how could a form be drama which can do quite without δρώμενα? Action which is everything for a drama is only incidental to the mime, the mime can even exclude action

entirely."

<sup>2</sup> Reich invented the "great mimic drama" in his book Der Mimus, Vol. I (1903), although no example of it had descended to us. Later when Grenfell published Oxyrhynchus 413 Reich seized upon it as proof that his "drama" had existed and restated his position in the Deutsche Litteraturzeitung, Vol. XXIV (1903), coll. 2679 ff., as follows: "From the time of Alexander the Great there arose in the larger Hellenic cities of the Orient the great mimic drama, growing out of the sung and the recited mimes. This so-called mimic hypothesis mingled prose and lyric parts, arias, and cantica. It soon won the stage of Rome and became Latinized. Philistion is the classic of the Greek hypothesis, Publilius Syrus and Decimus Laberius are the great names in the Latin derivative. Throughout the Graeco-Roman empire, in Europe, Asia, and Africa people received the mimic drama with acclaim, rulers and emperors cherished it, and later even the church fathers could not drive it from popular favor."

Unfortunately, the facts in the case do not bear out Reich's contention. In a recent and detailed study of the "Mimus von Oxyrhynchos" Sudhaus remarks (Hermes, Vol. XLI [1906], pp. 274, 277): "Reich's invention of the great mimic hypothesis, which flourished as early as the third century s.c. but had then to wait three centuries to find its classic in Philistion, deserves no confutation. It is urgently important to point out that Reich's constructions for the most part do not withstand examination, and that his predecessors, whom he does not treat in very friendly fashion, judged in many things more rightly than he. I say this particularly with reference to several verdicts

in Horovitz, Spuren griechischer Mimen im Orient (1905)."

<sup>3</sup> The opening chapter of Chambers' Mediaeval Stage is entitled "The Fall of the Theaters," and he employs therein without definition the words farce, mime, spectacle, performance, stage, theater, plot, and actor. But an examination of his sources shows

to believe it. Theorize about the matter we can, but proofs are lacking.

At first, perhaps, the dramatic mimes were low-comedy pieces and farces which shared their popularity with comedies of a higher sort, like those of Plautus and Terence; at first, perhaps, the sung and recited mimes were witty dialogues, satirical reflections, topical hits, dramatic portrayal of the life of the day, which alternated at entertainments of the great houses with author's readings, like that of the Querolus for example.\(^1\) Both publicly and privately, that is, a definite and skilful dramatic art lent itself to the realistic reproduction of life. But even if this is true of the older character of the mime, when the decay of culture came a change ensued. The mime degenerated until it pandered to the worst instincts of humanity.

#### 2. Mimus: Roman Vaudeville

Paegnion was the word for everything beneath the "legitimate" or dramatic type of mimus. If anything mimic was fitted to endure across the fifth century\_into the European world of the Dark and Middle Ages, surely it was paegnion.

For one might be blind and yet enjoy himself. There was music both vocal and instrumental, there was the squealing and grunting as of pigs, there was the imitation of every animal's bleat, squawk, or bellow. One could be deaf and not miss overmuch, for there were sketches from all types of low-life and side-street, knockdown farces, take-offs, and acrobatic turns. One need not even understand the jargon of the players for an evening's fun, but could go like the

quickly that there is no evidence that any "mimic drama" was ever "acted" in any "play-house" in Rome. Nor will further study uncover such evidence. Cf. Jahn, Prolegomena ad Persii satiras (1843); Grysar, "Der römische Mimus," Wiener Sitzungsberichte, Vol. XII (1854); Führ, De mimis Graecorum (1860); Hörschelmann, "Der griechische Mimus," Baltische Monatsschrift (1892); Crusius, Untersuchungen zu den Mimiamben des Herondas (1892); Hauler, "Der Mimus von Epicharm bis Sophron," Xenia austriaca, Vol. I (1893); Nairn, The Mimes of Herodas (1904); Glock, Zeitschrift ür vergleichende Literaturgeschichte, Vol. XVI (1905).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The Querolus (or Aulularia) is announced by its author to be not for public presentation but for recitation in the circle of friends, for sociable entertainment, and for the amusement of a dinner party. Cf. Cloetta, Beiträge zur Literaturgeschichte des Mittelalters, Vol. I (1890), p. 2.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Cf. Reich, Der Mimus, Vol. I, pp. 417 ff. Sudhaus (loc. cit., p. 265) and Körte (Neus Jahrbücher für das klassische Allertum [1903], p. 538) make paegnion the generic term for all representations of real mimes, and consider it the general rather than the subordinate title.

modern tourist to tingeltangel or variété, sure of his reward. Who would not laugh if his host Trimalchio blew out his cheeks like a bugler, if a slave made mimic music on an earthen lamp and ate fire? Whose face would not burn at the nakedness of person and pantomime and words, which, to quote Plutarch, "intoxicated and stupefied the spirit more than strong wines?"

#### 3. Mimus: Roman Entertainer .

The preceding paragraph on paggnion has told us what to expect of these entertainers. Whatever they may have been in earlier times, in the fifth and sixth centuries the profession of mimus was not free from admixture of every kind. Histrio, prestigiator, scaenicus, tragoedus, comoedus, thymelicus, scurra, saltator, and mimus are so variously glossed by early commentators that we are at a total loss to separate the "artes lubricae" which they professed. Sidonius, who must be expected to know, says that the histriones boasted of doing the same thing as Philistio, but falsely. Cassiodorus specifically refers to a certain Sabinus as "histrio, equorum moderator et auriga," to a Thomas as "auriga, maleficus et magus." The mimes were dramatic performers of one sort and another, reciters of obscenest jokes, charioteers, high-jumpers, dancers, magicians, sleight-of-hand workers, and ill-doers generally. We are transported from the stage, from the realm of private theatricals, to the tent of the circus and to the lascivious pleasures of dinner tables. Let us be not misled to think the thing otherwise. The men appear in motley or harlequin dress, the women more or less naked. One indulges in rodomontade and the absurdest boasting, another gives imitations of human customs and characters, a third portrays lewd matters: to the accompaniment of drums and cymbals a man or woman enters and plays the rôle of prostitute, pander, adulterer, or drunkard. A fourth is conjurer. Any sort of coarse comedy, grimacing, imitation of the cries of animals is welcome.2

Such, then, is the Roman mimus, performance and performer, which the Germans knew from the fourth century on at least, and

 $<sup>^1</sup>$  Cf. Table-talks, VII, vii, 4. The unspeakable lasciviousness of Theodora's pantomime which Procopius cites was probably nothing rare.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Cf. Scherer, Geschichte der deutschen Dichtung im zi. und zii. Jahrhundert, p. 12.

knew undoubtedly in three different ways: (1) from personal acquaintance in Italy whither a tribal migration had led them; (2) from hearsay and from the graphic description of returning wanderers; (3) from personal acquaintance in Germany, whither the mimus from the earliest historical times, sallying forth from Roman frontier garrisons, penetrating ever farther, followed the steps of the southern merchant. These things I believe, and I also believe that some Roman mimes outlasted the sixth century a while and continued their profession in Romance territory as late even as the age of Charles the Great, though by no means so long in strictly Germanic territory. Some European minstrels doubtless owed certain of their tricks and turns at first directly or indirectly to mimes. But that the two—minstrel and mime—were for long centuries largely identical, I do not believe, and nothing in the records makes such a creed imperative, or even appealing.

#### Germanic scop

We are often so occupied in trying to discover what the Germans learned from Italy, that we forget to wonder just what manner of things they brought to Italy with them. The early records concerning Germanic singers and Germanic poetry are too incomplete to give us much definite information. From epic sources like the Anglo-Saxon Widsith, Beowulf, and Deor's Complaint we hear, as we should expect, only of a scop or epic singer. And historical works such as the chronicles of Cassiodorus, Priscus, Paulus Diaconus, and Jordanes, tell us naturally enough of the scopas who sang songs celebrating the deeds of their national heroes, and tell us of no other sort of German poet or poetry. But silence upon a point of this kind means necessarily nothing.

However this be, early epic poetry may be divided into two classes in any of three ways: (1) its origin, (2) its form, (3) its content. That is, (1) whether it was communal [choric] or artistic [individual] in source and utterance; (2) whether it was a ballad [divided into stanzas of an irregular number of verses] or a rhapsodic poem [a continuous series of long-verses without stanzaic division]; (3) whether it was hymnic song in praise of the gods and legendary heroes, or a song celebrating the deeds of great and important his-

torical personages.¹ But, whichever of these three manners of division we adopt, the result is largely the same: two kinds of poetry are the result. The first kind is an old traditional type of epic expression, presumably a common Germanic heritage from the Aryan past; the second kind is, it may be, a gradual development within historic times, coming perhaps into full swing in the fifth and sixth centuries, and including even songs of compliment to members of a ruling dynasty.² The Germanic scop undoubtedly had in his repertory both kinds: "mythische heroendichtung" and "historische heldendichtung." Of the one he was certainly the coryphaeus, of the other, so far as we know, he was the creator.

# Was there a professional Germanic jester?

We know about the scop: a distinguished epic singer, often the vassal of a king, honored, praised, and rewarded with the meed of hero.<sup>3</sup> Was this the only class of professional entertainer the Germanic peoples knew before their association with the Romans in the fourth and fifth centuries? Did the Germans of their own initiative not go in for realistic comedy and low farce of any kind?

From the records that we now have we cannot argue either for or against the existence of German entertainers of the lighter sort (mountebanks and minstrels) among the Germanic races previous to and during the tribal migrations. Even such mention of satirical

<sup>1</sup> I am not sure that I think much of any of these three methods of classification. In a forthcoming article on Epic and Romance I shall try to deal with old Germanic epic poetry, not as it should be, but as it is.

<sup>2</sup> Such as those from which Cassiodorus got his list of the ancestors of Amalasuintha, daughter of Theodoric. Cf. Variar. lib. xl, cap. 1; Jordanes, De origine actibusque Getarum, cap. 14, 17, 48; Zeitschr. f. deut. Alt., Vol. XII, p. 253; Kelle, Gesch. d. deut.

Lit., Vol. I (1892), pp. 10 f.

We have no proof that a heroic poetry celebrating the deeds of historical personages did not exist among the earliest Germans, except for the silence of Tacitus regarding the matter, and this is not proof. If this type of poetry was comparatively late, it is interesting to remember that it was either sprung from, or given its greatest impulse by, the poetically gifted Goths. It was two Goths who sang before Attila of his victories, the citharoedus Theodoric sent Clodewech was perhaps a Gothic scop (and not an Italian mimus), the Lombard Alboin (Ælfwine) is mentioned in Widsith (the Goths exerted strong influence upon the epic song of their neighbors the Lombards); and most important of all, most of the popular epic legendary material which has descended to us is of Gothic origin—Ermanrich, the Harlungs, Theodoric, Heime, Witig, Hildebrand and Hadubrand, perhaps Walter of Aquitania; except for the Frankish myth of Siegfried, the Nibelungen story is a poetic work of the Burgundians, a race most closely associated with the Goths.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Köhler, "Ueber den Stand berufsmässiger Sänger im nationalen Epos germanischer Völker," Germania, Vol. XV, pp. 27 ff.; Vogt, Leben und Dichtung der deutschen Spielleute (1876), pp. 4 f.; Anderson, The Anglo-Saxon Scop (1903).

songs as Ausonius makes in the Mosella is too vague to be of service, and other references are either too confused or too late in date. But while it is impossible to present evidence in proof that the early Germans had light entertainment and lyric song as well as heroic ballads, while speculation on this point often leads to purely dogmatic statement, it is always worth remembering that some of the comedy and realism, some of the lyrical forms of expression that we meet in Europe from the eighth century on, may be sprung from indigenous roots. That race which first of the modern cultural nations of Europe gives us merry stories, humorous songs, satires, and lyrics must have borrowed well, if they fetched this whole art from transalpine territory!

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> For we do not know that the dwellers in the Moselle region during the fourth century were Germans. Cf. Ausonii opuscula (Monumenta Germaniae historica, Auctores, Vol. V, ii), p. 87, and Kögel, Pauls Grundriss, Vol. II, p. 49.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Laughter-smiths there were in England at the time when the Exodus was written (43 wæron hleahtorsmiðum handa belocene; a reference apparently to the magicians of Egypt; cf. Blackburn, Exodus and Daniel [1907], p. 37), but even if hleahtorsmiö denotes a certain class of entertainer, this profession is not necessarily of early date or of native origin. Little definite is known regarding the functions of the northern bulr (who Müllenhoff asserts was the continuator of the entire Northern poetic tradition; Deutsche Altertumskunde, Vol. V, p. 300], but certain passages (e. g., Fafnismál 34; Hávamál stanzas 110-37) indicate that Mr. C. N. Gould is justified in believing commentators have regarded him too seriously. The Haraldskyaeði (or Hrafnsmål, ca. 900) speaks of jesters and jugglers: leikari, truër. "Andaër pets a dog without ears, plays foolish tricks and causes the king to laugh. There are also others who, it is said, bear a burning stick of wood through the fire, they have stuck blazing hats beneath their belts [!], these men who deserve a kick." Truor translates scurra in the Vulgate describing King David playing on the harp like a rough truor. The juggler was known to Ireland as early as the ninth century or earlier. Professor A. C. L. Brown calls my attention to clessamnach in the "Sick Bed of Cuchulinn," an ancient story in the Dun Cow MS (Windisch, Irische Texte, Vol. I, p. 206: "sing and act the part of jugglers") and another saga "The Destruction of Da Derga's Palace" tells of the juggler Tulchuine and of the three jesters at the fire (Hyde, Literary History of Ireland, pp. 391 f.; Whitley Stokes, Revue celtique, Vol-XXII [1901], pp. 286, 311).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Simply because such speculation is so apt to confuse poetic impulse and poetic achievement, because it assumes that since Germans may have had certain literary forms at a given time they actually did have them,—Kelle thus ascribes to the Germans of the first century sword-dance and drama (schauspiel), incantations, gnomic verses, and very possibly satires, love-songs, dance-ditties. Scherer accords even the old Aryans love-songs "in which a feeling for nature and the inner life were harmonized or contrasted;" cf. Scherer, Kleinere Schriften, Vol. I, p. 697 and Gesch. d. deut.  $Lit.^{10}$ , p. 7; Heinzel, Quellen und Forschungen, Vol. X, p. 49. Kögel assigns them satirical songs (Grundriss, p. 49): "Satirical poetry must have been current at an early period among a people with whom gnomic verse was a favorite form. Common to both types of poetry eigengrammatic acumination, they are different in that satirical verse is made for singing."

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> I ponder at this juncture the words of Tacitus (*Annales*, Bk. I, chap. 65): "Nox per diversa inquies, quum barbari festis epulis, laeto cantu aut truci sonore subjecta vallium ac resultantis saltus complerent" and (*Historias*, Bk. V, chap. 15): "Nox apud barbaros cantu aut clamore, nostris per iram et minas acta."

Now critics have felt that the mediaeval jongleur and spielmann are children of the Roman mimus for three reasons:

1. They have thought mimus as a dramatic performance existed as late as the fifth century.

2. When they met the term mimus (and its synonyms joculator, scurra, thymelicus, histrio) in records from the fifth to the tenth century, they believed this term to mean the same that it did in pre-Christian Rome.

3. No other ancestry for early mediaeval realistic art was visible to them, because of their preconceived idea that the Dark Ages could not bear such fruit unaided.

#### 1. Fifth-century drama

If there had been a mimic drama in Rome when the empire fell there would indeed be ground for the assumption that it lived on into the Middle Ages, but all the records cited by Reich² furnish no weightier arguments for the existence of such a drama than Grysar was able to produce fifty years before.³ In fact these very records show clearly enough that such a drama did not exist, for they are in large part the observations of men who were in a position to know of what they spoke, and nowhere, as Glock shows convincingly step by step, do they speak of mimus as a dramatic performance.⁴ We may therefore once and for all dismiss the specious theory of Reich and Sathas⁵ that either in Europe or in Asia a definite mimic drama lived on into the Middle Ages.⁵

¹A fourth "reason" given by Piper in his Spielmannsdichtung (1887), p. 3, I scarcely have the heart to cite; it sounds so absurd. He says: "That the unity of Roman scurra and German minstrel is an actual one is proven by the identity of their characteristic traits." Such reasoning, however, is not unique with Piper, as an examination of Weinhold, Die deutschen Frauen im Mittelalter (1851), pp. 351 ff.: Köpke, Ottonische Studien (1869), Vol. II, p. 176, will show. If such argument count for aught, many a performer on the modern Uberbrettl is likewise "identical with the Roman scurra."

<sup>2</sup> In his book Der Mimus (1903).

3 Wiener Sitzungsberichte, Vol. XII (1854), pp. 331 ff.

4 Zeitschr. f. vergl. Literaturgesch., Vol. XVI (1905), pp. 27 ff.

δ Ίστορικὸν δοκίμιον περὶ τοῦ θεάτρου τῶν βυζαντινῶν (1878), a view recently upheld by Tunison, Dramatic Traditions of the Dark Ages (1905), although sufficiently disproved by Krumbacher, Geschichte der byzantinischen Literatur 527-1428 (1897)<sup>2</sup>, p. 644; see also Chambers, Mediaeval Stage, Vol. I, p. 17.

<sup>6</sup> Therefore Chambers is in error when he says (op. cit., p. 83): "The Roman mimus was essentially a player of farces; that and little else. It is of course open to any one to suppose that the mimus went down in the seventh century playing farces, and that his like appeared in the fifteenth century playing farces, and that not a farce was played

We may then disregard the words of Heinrich Morf and of any other historian who finds actors engaged in dramatic production in Europe during the Dark Ages, for such words must for the present at least rest either on pure assumption or on the insecure and disingenuous combinations of Emil Reich.

### 2. The term mimus and its synonyms in records of the Dark Ages

More than thirty years ago Paul Meyer assigned to the mimi the beginnings of both Provençal and French literature<sup>2</sup> and Leon Gautier agreed with him.<sup>3</sup> Gaston Paris, with what would appear a surer insight, believed the mediaeval minstrel represented a merging of the mimi with the Germanic scopas.<sup>4</sup> Meyer says:

The point of departure for both [Provençal and French literature] is the same, and it is indeed humble. Testimonies which have been more than once collected, and which follow one another from the end of the Roman empire far into the Middle Ages, teach us of the existence of a class of individuals designated by the ancient names of scurrae, thymelici, later joculatores, public entertainers. They cross, without disappearing, the distress of the Merovingian and Carolingian eras. We meet them again in the eleventh century flourishing throughout Gaul.

Now let us see what Meyer has done. Without specifying in any case just what the work of these mimi was (scurrae, thymelici, joculatores) he makes this work of theirs the point of departure for

between. But is it not more probable on the whole that he preserved at least the rudiments of the art of acting, and that when the appointed time came the despised and forgotten farce blossomed forth once more as a vital and effective form of literature?"

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Morf says in his "Die romanischen Literaturen" pp. 144, 441 (Kullur der Gegenwart, I, xi, 1 [1909]): "From the days of the church fathers on there was no lack of clerical invective against the mimus. When because of the political and social downfall of the Roman empire the wealthy class and the great centers of culture had vanished, the Roman theater likewise fell, the drama disappeared, and the dramatic troupes crumbled and scattered. The mimus who till now had lived in companies of actors journeyed alone or with his mima as a wandering player through a world which had become barbarian. He amused his audiences by the practice of every profane art—music, singing, joking and juggling. The soil that had fostered his expensive maintenance in companies was gone, and thereafter dramatic operations on a large scale gave way to individual performances of a precarious and petty sort. The name mimus yielded to the title joculator ("jongleur"). As joculator scenicus this person is the continuator of that comic theater which, although outside of written tradition, existed in Romania through all the centuries."

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Romania, Vol. V (1876), p. 260.

<sup>3</sup> Les epopées françaises, Vol. II (1892)2, pp. 4 ff.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> La littérature française au moyen-âge (1890)<sup>2</sup>, p. 36; cf. also Chambers, Mediaeval Stage (1903), Vol. I, pp. 23 ff.

mediaeval Provençal and French literature.¹ Why does he do this? Because mimi in Rome furnished one sort of entertainment and mediaeval minstrels in central Europe furnished another sort of entertainment five hundred years later, and in the interval between the two the ancient names for entertainer, scurra, thymelicus, etc., are continued. Although I believe the looseness of this method is obvious I shall be at some pains to show how illogical I think Meyer's contention is.

Of course the ancient names for entertainer continue all through the Dark Ages, and deep into mediaeval times; we hear again and again of mimi, joculatores, scurrae, etc. Why should we not? Mimus had meant and long continued to mean entertainer, juggler, minstrel, poet. If a man of high or low degree chanced to be regarded by the common people of the seventh, eighth, or ninth centuries as an acceptable poet, that man was called mimus.

Of course the names continue. We hear of mimè in sixteenthcentury France<sup>2</sup>—in the farce *Maistre Mimin*—and much has been made of the fact. Why not make much of the fact that we have mimes and minstrels and jugglers in the twentieth century? Could

<sup>1</sup> If we make one thing the literary source of another, if we make the work of Roman mimi the source of the work of mediaeval jongleurs, then we mean the first thing is the direct and ascertainable source of the second thing. We do not mean that vaguely and despite our utter lack of proof the first thing is in a general sort of way perhaps in its age what the second thing is in its later time.

If we find, that is, in the work of any mediaeval jongleur forms, phrases, types of expression or of character, themes, ideas which are identical with, or similar to, the manner of Roman mimi, then and only then can we make mime spiritual ancestor of the jongleur. But if all these matters with which the work of the jongleur has to do are referred back to fifth-century Roman mimi simply because the Latin words for entertainer are not done away with in the records which mark the interim between that time and the time of the jongleur, then we have no right to make Roman mimus spiritual ancestor to

mediaeval jongleur.

For, if such a thing were permissible, we could trace back our mediaeval mimi to an antiquity more hoar than that indicated by the mimic dances to the phallic, fat-bellied spirits of fertility in the ninth century n.c. Schröder, proceeding from the theory of Silvain Lévi and Hertel that certain dialogue-songs in the Rigveda are texts of the oldest known dramatic-musical performances, has recently made it likely that these songs owe their inclusion in the canon of the book to their use as mysteries or cult-dramas. The hymns in burlesque manner he regards as mimes, one of which he calls "The Drunken Indra" (quoted from the review by E. H. in Litterarisches Zentrablatt (1909), col. 19, of von Schröder's Mysterium und Mimus im Rigveda (1908). It would, indeed, be a long line of honorable descent if we might thus trace our way from Gerhard Hauptmann (see Reich, Vol. I, p. 894) to dances which occurred centuries before the mimic poems in the Rigveda. But who would call the author of such a mimic poem from, say, 1500 p. c. a spiritual ancestor of Hauptmann!

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Reich, Der Mimus, pp. 849 ff., and Petit de Julleville, Répertoire du théâtre comique en France au moyen-âge (1886), p. 156; Chambers, Mediaeval Stage, p. 83.

the continuance of these names not be made to mean that we of today owe all our realistic portrayal in literature, all our magic of the theater directly to the Roman saltimbanques who set some Trimalchio's dinner table in a roar?

Names continue. All words do which symbolize general concepts. We hear of "comedy" and "tragedy" all the way from barbarian Rome to this very day; likewise of "epic" and "romance" and "lyric." But who will claim that there is a constant tradition of any one of these great divisions of literature from then till now? They have come and gone, risen and faded and fallen—the pressure of a changing world has shaped them. Church and popular festival, old religion and new philosophy, time of reform and season of indulgence, ephemeral fads and enduring verities—these are all mirrored somewhat in the realistic prose and poetry of the period which separates us from the dead past. And this sort of thing we owe by direct tradition to Roman saltimbanques? I doubt it.

<sup>1</sup> Comedy and tragedy during the Middle Ages were completely lost sight of except in name; cf. von Schack, Gesch d. dramatischen Lit. u. Kunst in Spanien, Vol. 1 (1854), p. 25; Piper, Archiv. f. Litteraturgesch., Vol. V (1875), p. 494; Cloetta, op. cit., p. 2; Glock, op. cit., p. 29. The epic is dead and yet the name is on the lips of all exactly as if it existed today; modern romances are very different things from mediaeval ones, etc. But who could read these things clearly from casual mention of the names of these literary types in widely separated records?

<sup>2</sup> In "a general way" everything reverts to something before it; in "a general way," then, modern jugglers and mimes are descended from ancient prototypes, just as modern stone-masons or cobblers are. (I choose cobblers because of the fine irony with which Winterfeld dismisses Herzog's contention that no connection existed between ancient and mediaeval mimes: "Also—Schuster gab es, bloss sie konnten keine Schuhe mehr machen?" Cf. Herrigs Archiv, Vol. CXIV [1905], p. 49, and Berliner philologische Wochenschrift [1904], No. 34.) Why try to make modern cobblers the children of Roman shoemakers of the fifth century? The boots of barbarian Rome are not the boots of nowadays. They differ in shape, color, materials, size, cost, method of making, purpose, and appeal. Of what avail to build up a theory regarding them in Rome and the direct indebtedness of modern boots to them, on the basis of numerous references to boots, shoes, slippers, pumps, and spats in chronicles and decretals of the Dark Ages, particularly if these references are unfailingly confused and indistinct?

The danger of misreading such records is obvious. A pamphlet of Kelle's is at hand to furnish a clever illustration (Wiener Sitzungsberichte, Vol. CLXI [1908], No. 2) of the absurdity to which the hunting of reminiscences of German paganism in mediaeval decretals may lead. "Chori saecularium," "cantica puellarum" we learn with a sigh are not the uproar of dance-rounds, not the immodest sport of girls' songs forcing their way to the ears of nuns in the cloister, as Wackernagel imagined; nor are they profane lays and ballads of maidens which early in the ninth century, according to good pagan custom, still crowded into the church and its vicinity and later were sung on holidays in the street and in houses, as Müllenhoff and Scherer asserted. They are just plain statements concerning the religious anthems of the laity and the hymnic songs of nuns. We can not even have longer, it seems, the heathen sacrificial meal in connection with "conviva in ecclesia."

# 3. No other ancestry than Roman mimus visible?.

It is still difficult for us to regard the tenth century sanely. Our attitude, which should be simply one of historical understanding based upon an examination of the relevant facts, is apt to be one of either admiration or reproach. Adulation, if we are still under the spell of that nineteenth-century Romanticism which substitutes poetry for philology and gives us delicate analyses à la Simrock of the nature myths, the heroic legend, the theogony of northern antiquity. Reproach, if we generalize from purely fortuitous or incidental sources of knowledge and hark back to the sermons, the satires, and the church-penitentials to show that in the tenth century intelligence was at a low ebb and moral integrity extremely rare.<sup>2</sup>

But if the critic of this time tries to free himself from preconception of it and proceeds toward a sympathetic insight into its life through careful study I cannot see how he will fail so to appreciate its achievements as to believe this tenth century incapable of producing fresh and realistic prose and poetry of its own initiative, and quite without the aid of any Roman vaudeville performer or his descendant. For the tenth century is in many ways a great age.

A thirst for knowledge is in it, as in the sixteenth century, even though both periods are in a sense times of preparation and of unfulfilled promises.<sup>3</sup> The humanists Richer of St. Remy and Gerbert of Rheims are not more isolated phenomena than were Thomas Platter and Johannes Butzbach.<sup>4</sup> A sheer delight in worldly literature penetrates every monastery.<sup>5</sup> Monks cultivate profane themes,

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Uhl, Winiliod (1908), p. 1.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Cf. Scherer's essay "Mittelalter und Gegenwart" in Vorträge und Aufsätze (1874), pp. 322 f.; also Charles Langlois, La société française au xiiie siècle (1904)<sup>2</sup>, pp. ii-xvi.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> See Scherer's interesting comparison of the two epochs in his Gesch. d. deut. Dichtung, pp. 2 ff.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Read of Richer's trip from Rheims to Chartres, that he might see the *Logic* of Hippocrates, *Richeri historiae*, ed. Waitz (1877), Bk. IV, chap. 50, and Ker's account of Gerbert, *Dark Ages*, pp. 198 ff. Nothing seems to warrant Egger's view (*L'hellénisme en France*, Vol. I, p. 51) that such figures as Richer and Gerbert in the tenth century, Scotus Erigens in the ninth, are exceptions and prodigies.

b Notker Labeo, for example, was urged to translate into German not only the Bucolies of Vergil, but the Andria of Terence; cf. Kelle, Gesch. d. deut. Lit., Vol. I, pp. 233 f. We also recall how Godehard, on assuming his duties in a new cloister, had Horace and Cicero's Letters sent to him. For further reference to monastic study of "frivolous" literature cf. Scherer, Geistliche Poeten der deutschen Kaiserzeit (1874, 1875), 2 vols.

and minstrels themes from sacred story.¹ Scherer's division of the poets of this day into two parties: one guild the ecclesiastics, the pillars of Christianity and of all really Scriptural culture in literary form, the other guild the minstrels, the wandering folk-singers, the inheritors of paganism and its poetry, cannot be accepted.² Nor did these two guilds "fight each other tooth and nail."

Monks and minstrels get their material everywhere, wander far in search of it, incorporate it into chronicles and collections of exempla and stories and thus lay the foundations for the innumerable chapbooks and romances of future ages. A literary tradition is begun for the lighter forms of art, one that feeds and parallels oral transmission. We meet now not only the phrase "in cantilenis priscis cantantur" but "in veteribus libris legitur." Particularly after the coronation of Otto I in 962 do clerks and minstrels journey indefatigably southward, to come back freighted with strange wares in the way of tales and entertaining poems; many a jovial monk and scholar sets this contraband of religion into Latin lines. Soldiers and peddlers back from Italy, eager to boast, eager to please, con-

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The Gesta Karoli has profane themes. Fableaux (schwänke) and mendacious songs (cantilenae mendosae) fairly sprout in the cloisters and grammar schools of the cathedrals. Many of these have their origin in definitely-known occurrences and in connection with the games and holiday pranks of the pupils. Such license as Fitz-Stephen tells of in the monastery schools of a later day existed at least as early as the ninth century, and no occasion was too trivial for its exercise. Witness how the youth "sang mocking songs of Notker when they had drunk wine," [so tuont noh kenuoge, singent fone demo der in fro (inreht uneret) how Gunzo of Novara was lampooned in mischievous verses (lascivulis versibus) by a youngster of St. Gall because the famous grammarian had used an accusative for an ablative. For other records see Kelle, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 205 f.; Allen, Modern Philology, Vol. VI, pp. 21, 398. Godehard, bishop of Hildesheim (1022-38) proves that monks and clerks are authors and amateurs of profane realistic poetry when he says: "Quoddam autem talium genus, illorum scilicet, qui vel in monachico vel canonico vel etiam Graeco habitu per regiones et regna discurrunt, quos et Platonis more Perypatheticos irridendo cognominavit, illos, inquam, prorsus exprobrando quasi execrabatur."-Monum. Germ. hist. Scriptores, Vol. XI, p. 207. On the other hand the minstrels often took their subjects from sacred legend and story: the theme of little John the monk is from the Vitae patrum (cf. Allen, Modern Philology, Vol. V. p. 468), the Triumphus Sancti Remacli (eleventh century) is by a "cantator quidam jocularis" (Monum. Germ. hist. Scriptores, Vol. XI, p. 456), etc.

 $<sup>^2</sup>$  Cf. Scherer's essay on the intellectual life in mediaeval Austria in his  $\it Vortr\"age~und~Aufs\"atze,~p.~130.$ 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Minstrels borrow their materials from the old myths, the animal-fable, legend, heroic story drolly distorted (Saleman and Morolly), history, and daily life. "In this way a multitude of German 'ales, legends, and fableaux certainly owe their origin to the activity of these ministrels in the ninth, tenth, and eleventh centuries. This time was apparently the richest quarry for them."—Mallenhoff, Sagen, Marchen, Lieder, p. xix.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> De fundatione monasterii Tegrinsee; Pez, Thesaurus anecdotarum novus, Vol. III, Pt. ii, p. 493.

tribute their quota. The old story is being retold: German armies are crossing the Alps, sweeping victoriously over northern Italy (this time Lombardy), stopping a while near the center of the world's culture to gather their spoils of war, streaming homeward laden with booty, some of gold—most of civilization and of art,

Now this is the sort of age which critics think could not bear rich fruitage of its own. And so we are asked to find its origin in the Italian mimus. Heyne pictures these mimi¹ increasing in German territory during the migration period, venturing out singly or in troops to the village or the isolated manor, following the bands of warriors, presenting in camp their pantomimes, puppet-shows, sword-plays, gladiatorial exercises, and arts of legerdemain.² He says these mimi outlasted the migration period and continued to thrive during the following epochs.

Let Johannes Kelle continue the tale. He has gathered his information from the most diverse sources from fourth to thirteenth century and this is the result: In the beginning of the ninth century, ever increasing in numbers, there roamed throughout the Frankish empire the descendants of the old mimi and histriones, who had become completely demoralized in the Merovingian epoch. Pipers, drummers, fiddlers, singers, dancers, jugglers, blood-letters, barbers, cuppers had likewise in the ninth century become indispensable to the Germanic people, much as the latter despised them because of their un-German venality and their insatiable greed. They added luster to every festive occasion by their dances, obscene songs, topical hits, and legerdemain. The Roman mimi were everywhere most welcome guests, but especially at wedding banquets.

And Winterfeld may add the epilogue: In the middle of the eleventh century he thinks "it would seem a matter of course that mimes shot out of the earth like mushrooms after a rain," he avers

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> In his essay on "Unehrliche Hantierungen" in Das alldeutsche Handwerk (1908), pp. 101 ff.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> These phrases of Heyne are apparently based upon no surer a foundation than the moonlit picture by Freytag (Bilder aus der deutschen Vergangenheit, Vol. II, Pt. i, pp. 445 f.) of the well-known passage in Procopius (De bello vandalico, Bk. II, chap. 6) "Roman jugglers and mimes presented before the bloody Vandal hordes the obscenest pantomimes." Cf. Crome's preface to Das altdeutsche Handwerk, p. vi.

<sup>3</sup> Gesch. d. deut. Lit., Vol. I, p. 70.

<sup>4</sup> This list is from the Sachsenspiegel, ed. Homeyer (1861)3, p. 194.

that Notker and Roswitha owe the best of their work to these mimi, and ends by saying that only through the mime and his continued existence can one understand and explain the literary development of the centuries.<sup>1</sup>

We are, then, asked to believe the following: Roman mimes before and after the fall of the empire spread northward in the pursuit of their profession. They adapted themselves so snugly to the ideas of their new environment, by catering to old social needs and creating novel ones, that they handed down their art from father to son, from teacher to pupil for eight centuries. They became the mouthpiece for every sort of popular entertainment outside the pale of literary transmission.

Now, if this be so, we can discover the traces of these thousands of all-important people not only in the sorry lists of their class-names in dusty chronicle and decretal, but here and there and everywhere in the lighter and more realistic writings of their day. We shall find, as Winterfeld wants us to, these mimi peering out from behind fables, tales, romances, dramas, fableaux, satires, historical poems, sacred ballads, and lyric poems.<sup>2</sup> And here I shall look for

<sup>1</sup> Herrigs Archiv, Vol. CXIV, pp. 74, 49.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> There is something illogical in according the mimi during the Dark Ages a lion's share in molding and continuing all the realistic and popular themes of these times, and at the same breath excluding them from active participation in that one enduring form of poetic narrative and expression which for centuries as yet unnumbered held the German fancy captive: the heroic epic. Ages before the minstrel-romances Herzog Ernst and König Rother Winterfield's mimes should have "polished up the motives of native heroic legend with adventurous journeys and coarse jokes," if these mimi are what he supposes them to be. Then too, we should find an explanation for some things in Ekkehard's Waltharius, and it would be the descendant of a Roman mime who furnished accidental plot and bye-work for the materials of the Latin Nibelung-story.

If I were convinced these southern mimi played the rôle in the literature of the Dark Ages which Winterfeld pretends, I should not hesitate to find in their activity an explanation for various puzzling matters in the early transmission of German popular epic stories and legends. No false "piety" would deter me. A fine characterization of such "piety" breathes in Michel Bréal's essay on the first influence of Rome on the Germanic world (Journal des savants [1889], pp. 624, 626, 697). I should believe, for instance, that the heroic songs of the Goths were first and best and most enduring of all Germanic popular ballads because they came closest to an appreciation of the work of the Roman mimi and were most affected by it, If such mimes as Winterfeld's were mine, I should understand why much of the older epic material was in the form of a comparatively short dramatic ballad (Ker, Epic and Romance [1908]?; Heusler, Lied und Epos [1905]), not one that could be used as a single chapter in the framework of a long narrative epic, but a compact and individual unit. For I should realize how close such work is to other effort of which Winterfeld suspects the mime: historical ballad, for instance.

Bédier (Les légendes épiques [1908]) has recently had strange tales to tell us of how certain chansons de geste originated and first achieved their popularity. Whatever acceptance his conclusions may gain in the field of French epic legends, one matter of

them. Now unless I discover traces of their handiwork here in no uncertain way I shall disbelieve—as I have good right to—that there is any connection between Roman mime and mediaeval jongleur and spielmann. It is, of course, in the literary records of the Dark Ages that I shall hunt, for if the thread of continuity snap at this point, it is little likely that it was ever thereafter mended. And now to work.

PHILIP SCHUYLER ALLEN

#### THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

general import he has given us. He has shown that epic ballads (heroic songs) did not mysteriously evolve the moment some conspicuous deed of prowess was done, and then go echoing in oral transmission down the centuries until some tardy mediaeval person wrote a romance based upon these ballads. Rather was a deliberate art requisite at the beginning, and literary instead of oral preservation to be supposed. Now as the brightest and most adaptable poets in Europe for six critical centuries or so were the descendants of Roman miml, if they were as Winterfeld supposes, it would be they who accounted for the humor and life of older epic material, for the first-hand description of it, for its realism and its dramatic pressure. Such mimi would then teach us why the German epic is not one sort of thing: an unalloyed alliterative poetry, the treasured formula of generations of scopas, but rather a mosaic of elements, diverse in manner and matter, wherein

we find lyric and pastoral and dramatic and gnomic ingredients.

Were Winterfeld's mimi mine, I should account for the disappearance of the old alliterative poetry and the appearance of end-rime, not by saying it sprang from a degeneration or torpescence of the stave-form itself, but hold it due to the influence of Latin popular poetry brought into Germany by mimi. I should then believe the fall from favor of the old-fashioned harp-playing vassal the result, not of the rise of the Frankish empire and the consequent decline of the smaller courts, but of the new popularity of Italian mimi. The demoralization, or humanizing, of the mythical elements in heroic poetry, the appearance in it of new personalities (Henry, the Ottos, their supporters and opponents), the newer sort of epic poetry dealing with contemporary events—these things might find explanation, not so much in the national consciousness which Germany developed under the Saxon emperors, as in the successful practice of poetry by the guild of Italian mimi. A shorter type of lyrical popular ballad which appears in the ninth and tenth century might, too, be conditioned by new music and melodies introduced by mimi —if they were only such as we are asked to believe them.

# A SEMASIOLOGIC DIFFERENTIATION IN GERMANIC SECONDARY ABLAUT.—Concluded

139. N. snikka 'cut, clip; reproach, blame' : snakka 'talk, prattle' : snukka 'snuff, sniffle, scent.'

D. snige (strong, I) 'sneak, slink, skulk': snage 'rummage, snuff about.'

E. sneak 'slink, skulk,' dial. snick 'cut sharply, notch, clip; give a quick sudden blow, strike smartly; hang fire,' snicker 'titter, laugh suppressedly': dial. snack 'snatch, bite, snap, break with a snap, make a cracking noise; share': dial. snock 'give a downward blow on the head or top of anything': dial. snuck 'smell, olfacere': dial. snook 'smell with a loud inspiration, snuffle, snort, speak through the nose; snore; sneak, lie concealed, steal': dial. snowk 'smell, sniff; poke about with the nose.'

Dutch snikken 'sob, gasp' : snakken 'chatter (of the teeth); gasp, sob, hanker after.'

WVI. snikken 'hiccough': snakken 'grab for something; bissig und kurz antworten,' snaken 'feurig begehren': snokken 'shove, jerk, push jerkingly.'

OF. snikken, snükken 'schluchzen, stossweise einen Laut hören lassen': snakken 'reden, sprechen; plaudern, schwatzen': snukken = snikken.

Westf. snickeln 'gelinde mit der Peitsche klatschen': snacken 'mit der Peitsche klatschen, schlagen': snuckern 'schluchzen,' snuck m. 'Anekdote, Schnurre': snicksnack 'variierendes Schnacken mit der Peitsche.'

Hess. schnacken, schnacksen 'schnarchen' : schnucken 'naschen.'

Stieg. schnacken 'schwatzen' : schnucken 'schluchzen.'

Els. schnickle 'Unzucht treiben': Schnak f. m. 'Stechmücke, kleine schwächliche Person; Schwank, Geschwätze': schnuckle 'sich zusammenkauern, sich in die Decke einhüllen.'

Bav. schnicken 'schnell bewegen, schnellen': schnackeln 'einen knallenden oder schnalzenden Laut erheben, schnallen; 345]

45 [MODERN PHILOLOGY, January, 1910]

schnipfen; eine rasche Bewegung machen': schnuckeln 'lecken, saugen, naschen.'

139a. E. dial. snig 'cut, chop off, lop off,' dial. snig at 'speak sharply and peevishly to, nag; give a sudden jerk; pull; steal, pilfer; neigh,' dial. snigger 'laugh in a suppressed or foolish manner, giggle, laugh sneeringly; cut unevenly,' dial. sniggle 'giggle; catch fish; wriggle away,' dial. sniggle in 'obtain in an underhand manner,' sniggle up 'toady': dial. snag 'cut off branches, hew roughly, mow, tear an angular rent; nibble; snap, bite, tease, quarrel, chide, snarl,' dial. snagger 'snore with a harsh, grating sound,' dial. snaggle 'cut, notch, hack, cut awkardly, snatch, snarl, grumble': dial. snug 'nestle, hug, fondle; put in order, make trim, compact, and tidy,' snuggle 'cuddle up, nestle, lie close,' dial. 'make compact.' Cf. also No. 139 Els. and perhaps Bav.

140. E. slip 'slide, glide along; slink': slap 'hit with the open hand': slope 'incline, slant,' slop 'soil with a liquid.'

Dutch slippen 'slit; slip, 'glide': slepen 'drag, trail, draggle': slappen 'abate, slack, slacken': slopen 'pull down, demolish, break up, raze, consume, exhaust.'

OF. slippen 'gleiten, schlüpfen; schlitzen, aufschneiden': slappen 'schlaffen,' ferslaffen 'erschlaffen': slopen 'schleifen, platt legen, abtragen, zerbrechen': slupen 'gleiten, schlüpfen, kriechen.'

Hess. schlappen 'schlappen; lappen, auflecken': schluppen 'saugen.' Cf. 14a, D.

140a. N. slabba 'smack, suck continually; splash, spill': slubba 'splash, spill, proceed carelessly.'

S. dial. slabba 'soil wet,' dial. slabbra i sej 'eat hastily and carelessly': dial. slubba 'mix carelessly; slouch,' dial. slubbra 'be unclear; drag one's feet.'

D. slibe (strong, I) 'grind, cut,' slibrig 'slippery': slubre 'make a slobbering noise in eating or drinking.'

E. dial. slibber 'lose one's footing, slide; slouch': dial. slabber 'wet the thread in spinning; swallow one's words; gulp down, daub, dirty, walk through mud': dial. slobber 'moisten with saliva; slop, spill, daub, eat in a dirty manner; weep many tears, blubber': dial. slubber 'daub, besmear, obscure with dirt; drink with a gurgling noise; be careless.'

Dutch slibberen 'slip': slabberen 'slobber, slabber, lap': slobberen 'slabber, lap up; bungle, lubber over; stammer, mutter.'

WVl. slibberen 'be slippery': sloeberen 'slabber, eat slaveringly.'

Westf. slabbern 'beim Essen u. Trinken etwas verschütten': slobber 'schmutzige Brühe (für Schweine)': slubbern 'schlürfen, auflecken (vom Vieh).'

141. S. dial. slimpa 'tear, rip': slampa 'be negligent.'

Bav. schlampen 'Flüssiges mit der Zunge einschöpfen; gierig u. unreinlich essen; schlapp herabhängen': schlumpen 'unreinlich sein.'

142. S. sladda 'drag,' sladdra 'prattle, jabber, gossip' : sluddra 'fritter away, use carelessly; stutter, sputter, talk unclearly' : slidder-sladder n. 'nonsense, bosh.'

D. sladder (c) 'tattle, gossip' : sludder (c, n) 'fudge, balderdash.'

E. dial. slidder 'slide, slip, disappear, walk lazily, pronounce rapidly and indistinctly; delay, defer': dial. sladder 'spill, scatter, make a wet, dirty mess': dial. slodder 'spill, splash, make a dirty mess with': dial. sludder 'eat in a slovenly way, pronounce slurringly, indistinctly.'

OF. sliddern 'gleiten, glitschen': sladdern 'klatschen, klatschernd regnen': sluddern 'schleppend, schlaff gehen, schlottern, sludern, slüdern 'schlaff, matt, schläfrig hinsinken, schlummern.'

Wald. *šladeren* 'vor Frost beben, klappern' : *šluderen* 'schlottern; schlendern.'

Pr. schliddern 'auf der Eisbahn hingleiten': schloddern 'schlottern, lose u. schlaff hin u. herschwanken': schluddern, schlūdern 'flüchtig, nachlässig, schlecht arbeiten; auf dem Eise gleiten.'

Bav. schledern 'im Wasser hin u. her schwenken (als, Wäsche)': schludern 'übereilt oder nachlässig arbeiten; schlottern; plaudern.'

143. N. slentre 'saunter, lounge about' : sluntre 'skulk, shirk.'

D. dial. slente, slentre 'kill time without use or profit': dial. slante 'loiter about, have no definite purpose': dial. slunte 'be slow and unenergetic at one's work,' dial. sluntre 'be disorderly.'

144. N. slirpa 'give a quick blow with something elastic, lash': slarpa 'give a blow with something soft and wet, slap, clap, splash, smear, spill': slurpa 'slobber, suck with a smacking sound.'

Groningen slieren 'schlürfen' : iets sloeren loaten 'neglect; postpone.'

Zaan. slieren 'eine schlenkernde Bewegung machen; schlottern': sloeren 'schlotternd, langsam, schlaff gehen.'

OF. slīren, sliren 'gleiten, schlüpfen, schleppen; sich leise und sanft gleitend bewegen': slören 'schleifend, träge, nachlässig gehen, schlendern': slūren, sluren 'schleppend, schlaff und unordentlich gehen.'

145. Groningen slikken 'lecken': slok 'schlaff.'

OF. slikken 'schlecken, schlürfen, mit der Zunge gleitend, leise, sanft über etwas hinfahren': slakkern 'beim Essen flüssiger Speisen sich besudeln; anhaltend fein regnen': sluken, slūken 'schlucken, schlingen, verzehren.'

Westf. slickern 'Kot spritzen; etwas abschütteln,' sik slickern 'langsam gehen': slackern 'schneien, wenn Regen dabei; zappeln (von Fischen); schlenkern; taumelnd gehen': sluckern 'schluchzen; naschen.'

Wald. *šlikeren* 'spritzen, schleudern' : *šlakeren* 'durcheinander regnen und schneien.'

Pr. schlickern 'schaukelnd baumeln; ab u. zu einen Schluck nehmen': schlackern 'schaukelnd wackeln, schlenkern; zwecklos gehen; essen, meist mit schlürfendem Ton': Schlocker m. 'langsamer Mensch von schlotternder Haltung': Schlucker m. 'wiederholtes, krankhaftes Aufstossen, Schluchzen.'

146. E. slink (st.) 'sneak, skulk, loiter': dial. slank 'slink away; go about in listless fashion': dial. slunk 'wade through a mire.'

147. OF. schaffen 'essen' : schuffeln 'unordentlich u. gierig essen.'

148. N. skimla 'glimmer, give forth glints or flashes, squint, rise tremblingly, wander restlessly,' skimta 'glint, flash, move with flashing rapidity': skuma 'grow dark,' skumla 'scowl, cast down the eyes,' skumta 'grow dark; take an interval of rest at twilight.'

149. Stieg. schittern 'in starke zitternde Bewegung setzen oder darin sein': schattern 'hell gackernd schreien': schuttern schittern.

Els. schittle 'schütteln, sich aus einer Sache ziehen': schattere 'klingen wie ein zersprungenes Gefäss, klappern, rasseln, dröhnen': schottle 'schütteln, wackeln,' schottere 'schüttern, erschüttern.'

Bav. schitteln 'schütteln': schattern 'laut auflachen, schäkern, schwatzen, klingen wie ein gespaltener Topf': schötteln 'schütteln, hin u. her bewegen': schuttern 'in Bewegung setzen; stossen.'

150. N. skaldra 'rattle, clash, clatter': skuldra 'make a dull noise (as when furniture is being moved).'

151. N. skirra 'scare, frighten': skarra 'walk slowly and waveringly; barely suffice; bring forth a rough throat-sound; clear the throat, speak uvular R; growl, whine,' skarka 'walk heavily, draggingly, as with a burden; work hard with the wings; grow slow, grow weak': skurra 'shove so as to give a thundering noise (as, shove a table along the floor), scrub, scrape; warn,' skurka 'give a scratching, grating sound; escape from a duty.'

OF. scharren 'scharren, kratzen' : schurren, schuren, schüren 'scharren, kratzen, scharf über etwas hinfahren, dass es ein dumpfes Geräusch macht.'

152. E. dial. shackle 'shake, joggle, rattle; disorder; waste; crack; idle about': dial. shuckle 'shuffle, slink in walking.'

153. N. skrappa 'bang, hammer': skruppa 'put together unreliably wooden implements or vessels.'

Lux. schrappen 'schaben, unehrlich sammeln' : schruppen 'mit der Bürste waschen.'

Hess. schrappen 'kratzend schaben, scharren': schruppen 'schruppen.'

153a. E. scribble 'write small or poorly': dial. scrabble 'scratch, paw, crawl, scramble, drub': dial. scrobble 'scratch, paw, scramble, crawl': dial. scrubble 'struggle, work laboriously, raise an uproar.'

154. E. dial. scraffle 'struggle, scramble, creep, tumble, shuffle, quarrel, wrangle, dispute': dial. scruffle '= scraffle; rustle.'

155. N. skrima 'gleam forth, appear faintly as in a mist; have poor sight, glow faintly (of twilight)': skramla, 'rattle, resound': skruma 'talk roughly or threateningly, scold,' skrumla 'give a hollow, unharmonious sound, make a darker noise than skramla.'

156. N. skratla 'rattle, creak; laugh aloud' : skrutla 'shudder.'

157. N. skrilta 'walk lightly, slowly, half glidingly, as over thin and slippery ice; glide; steal ahead': skralta 'walk with small and weak steps': skrulta 'walk with one's head hanging and one's back bent, walk skulkingly.'

158. N. skrikla 'shout, rejoice (of children and birds); creak, crack, scrape, walk shakily and with cracking joints': skrakla 'give a grating, rattling or scraping sound, laugh loud and gratingly; be brittle; walk loosely, slowly, unsurely, or with difficulty; patch up, bungle': skrukla 'give a short rattling noise somewhat darker than skrakla, work unreliably, patch, bungle.'

159. N. skvipa 'press out or spirt out in a thin stream,' skvipla 'take frequently and in small portions from a liquid so that it unnoticeably disappears': skvapa 'send out through a small opening a wavelike mass; talk loud and much, emptily; bubble, gluck (of liquids),' skvapla 'give small waves, spill by means of waves.'

160. N. skvitra 'splash, sprinkle, scatter, spirt out in thin streams': skvatra 'plash, ripple.'

161. N. skvisla 'splash, = skvasla but with lesser momentum and a thinner noise; scatter': skvasla 'splash, scatter.'

162. OF. swippe 'das letzte dünne, schlanke Ende einer Peitschenschnur': swappen 'schwingend bewegen, klatschend schlagen, mit Geräusch schleudern oder werfen.'

Thur. schwippen 'schnelle Bewegungen machen': schwappen 'schwingende Bewegungen machen; hauen; überlaufen,' schwappeln 'schwanken, sich hin u. her bewegen; gedankenlos reden.'

163. E. dial. swittle 'wash gently, dabble in water; cut, whittle a stick and leave the pieces lying about': dial. swattle 'swallow greedily and noisily, drink; waste, squander; beat soundly.'

164. N. lebba 'speak indistinctly, with lazy articulation, speak languidly and slowly': labba 'shuffle, walk carelessly; slap smackingly': lubba 'walk heavily, slowly, and swayingly.'

165. N. lima 'dawn, break (of the day)': lamra 'wear out with perpetual use': luma 'doze, be sleepy,' lumra 'walk unsurely, limpingly, stiffly, sleepily.'

WVI. limmen 'glimmen, anbrechen (vom Tag)': lommer m. Vn. 'Schatten gegen die Sonnenglut, fr. l'ombre; besonders, schwüler, mit Wolken überzogener Sommerhimmel.'

 $165\,a.\,$  Els. lampe 'schlaff herabhängen': lumpe 'nichts arbeiten u. statt dessen im Wirtshaus liegen u. trinken.'

165b. N. lamsa 'slap with a paw or fist, slap carelessly or roughly; go ahead languidly and with long, heavy, unsure strides': lumsa 'hobble, walk heavily and carelessly.'

166. Zaan. lidderen 'move tremblingly back and forth, quake, shake': lodderen 'bask in the sun, coddle oneself in the sun.'

167. S. dial. lisk 'be false while smiling' : luska 'sneak about to hear something.'

168. D. lalle 'babble' : lulle 'lull.'

E. *lilt* 'sing softly, hum, croon; sing merrily': *loll* 'lie lazily about; hang out from the mouth (of the tongue)': *lull* 'soothe, become calm,' dial. *lult* 'idle, lounge, lean against.'

Dutch *lillen* 'shake, quiver, shiver': *lellen* 'tattle, prattle incessantly': *lollen* 'waul, caterwaul, sing badly, bray; warm one's hands at a fire-pot': *lullen* 'talk nonsense, prate; cheat, gull.'

Westf. *lällebeck* m. 'fader, schwatzhafter junger Mensch': *lollen* 'laut weinen; ein gewisses Miauen, das dem lauten Weinen ahnelt.'

Els. lalle 'lallen, betrunken sein; lechzen, vor Durst die Zunge heraushängen lassen': lulle 'saugende Bewegungen mit Lippen u. Zunge machen, saugen; vom Essen alter Leute; trinken; rauchen.'

Schw. lälle 'die Zunge herausstrecken oder heraushängen lassen; die Lippen lecken; auflodern (von Flammen)': lāle 'nachlässig, undeutlich vor sich hin singen, sich emfältig gebärden': lulle 'saugen, die Zunge heraushangen lassen; naschen; undeutlich reden, wie wenn man etwas im Munde hätte.'

Bav. lallen 'mit schwerer Zunge sprechen' : lullen 'saugen.'

169. N. lira 'move ahead in small jerks; be on the watch; steal up to one; examine': lera 'watch, look at': lura 'watch,

lie in wait, steal up, sneak, outwit' :  $l\bar{u}ra$  'hang the head, doze

(mostly of cattle in bad weather); slap gently.'

170. N. likka 'move, shove, move very slightly, wriggle, be loose in the joints; try something small and secret,' likra 'wriggle, shake, crack, drop from looseness in joints or attachment': lakka 'trip, walk lightly, run, hop on one foot, pass, move on (of time); fasten by a point, hang up,' lakra 'rock, wobble, be loosely joined.'

WVI. lekken 'lick': lokken 'drink suckingly.'

171. N. ripla 'scratch, stripe': rapla 'rattle lightly; babble': rupla 'shake, put out of order.'

E. rtp 'divide by tearing or cutting': ripple 'have or cause small waves': rap 'strike sharply.'

WVl. rippen 'tear open, tear hastily': rappen 'move speedily.'
Westf. sik rippeln 'sich schnell fort machen': rappeln 'klappern, Getöse oder Geräusch machen; halbverrückt sein': ripprapp m. 'Necklied.'

Wald. sek ripelen 'sich rühren': rapelen 'rasseln,' et rapelt bei ieme 'er ist verrückt,' sek rapelen 'sich beeilen.'

Lux. rappen 'zerren, zupfen; zerreiben' : ruppen 'rupfen (ein Huhn).'

Thur. rippeln 'rühren, bewegen': rappeln 'klappern, klappernd sich bewegen; raffen': ruppeln 'raffen, rühren.'

Hess. rippeln 'sich regen, leise Bewegungen machen; sich beeilen' : berappeln 'bestrafen; überfallen.'

Stieg. sich rippeln 'sich regen, gewöhnlich in der Wendung sich nich rippeln un rējen': råppeln, rappeln, rāpeln 'raffen, zusammenraffen; klappern, in schneller Bewegung rasseln.'

172. N. ribba 'pluck, tear out the feathers': rabba 'talk, 'prattle; snatch, tear to one; do work in a hurry, fling it off': rubba 'scrub, make even or harrow down loosely, take the scales from a fish.'

E. dial. ribble 'read or recite quickly, gabble; work hastily and carelessly': dial. rabble 'talk or read quickly and indistinctly, gabble; speak confusedly, make a noise as of a stream, babble, wrangle, work hastily and carelessly': dial. robble 'tangle': rub 'reiben, fricare,' dial. rubble 'crawl or wriggle amongst dirt and refuse': ribble-rabble 'idle confused talk.'

Wald. riwelen 'zwischen den Fingern drehen' : rawelen 'schnell u. undeutlich schwatzen.'

Lux. rabbelen 'jemandem alles abgewinnen': rabbelen 'rasseln, klappern; halbverrückt sein': rubbelen 'rütteln, ubereilt handeln, klappern, rumpeln; hastig abmachen u. deshalb schlechte Arbeit liefern.'

172a. OF. riffeln 'lose u. locker werden, fasern; mit einem scharfen Instrument streifig, rinnig oder furchig machen, cannelieren': ruffeln 'schnell, flüchtig, unordentlich arbeiten, oberflächlich behobeln; Falten oder Krausen in etwas machen.'

173. S. dial. rammla 'fall down with a crash; beat with a crash, thrash, rattle, prattle noisily': dial. rummla 'play pranks, be noisy, make a racket.'

Dutch rammelen 'rattle, clink; chatter; rut, couple': rommelen 'mix up, put out of order; roar, rumble, thunder; buzz; grumble.'

OF. rammeln 'wiederholt stossen, schlagen; klappern, lärmen, rumoren': rummeln 'ein anhaltendes und wiederholtes dumpfes Getöse machen, sich mit dumpf tönendem und dumpf stossendem Geräusch bewegen.'

Westf. remmeln, rammeln 'bespringen (von Hasen, Kaninchen, etc.)': rummeln 'Geräusch machen; geschwind etwas tun.'

Els. rammle 'coire; schäkern, raufen; sich mutwillig herumtreiben': rummle 'donnern.'

173a. E. ramp 'climb or creep as a plant; leap, bound' : romp 'gambol, tumble.'

Bav. rimpfen (st.) 'aufritzen, zusammenziehen': rampfen 'raffen, herausziehen': rumpfen 'runzlicht machen, verziehen.'

173b. N. rimsa 'talk, patter; tear or cut to shreds': remsa 'talk prattle': ramsa 'walk with fast, long strides; work quickly and carelessly; tear, talk rapidly': romsa 'shake up; mumble; move in one's sleep.'

174. N. ratla 'wander, walk unsurely': rutla 'rattle; amble; roar like distant thunder, make a dull noise.'

E. dial. rittle 'wheeze, snore, make a rattling noise in the throat': rattle 'clatter; speak noisily,' dial. 'prate; pronounce

uvular R': dial. ruttle 'rattle, rustle, breathe with a rattling sound, laugh suppressedly; snore; gurgle': rittle-rattle 'rattle.'

WVI. reutelen 'stir up; make a rattling, knocking or rustling sound': uitratelen 'blab out, tattle out': rotelen, ruttelen 'make a rattling, knocking or rustling sound,' ruttelen 'shake, rattle.'

Wald. rütelen, 'rütteln' : rätelen 'laut durcheinander sprechen,' ratelech 'schlotterig.'

Lux. reselen 'ratteln, rasseln' : rässelen 'leidenschaftlich spielen,' raselen 'rauschen' : roselen 'die Kinderrassel bewegen.'

175. OF. ratsen 'reissen, kratzen, verwunden': rutsen 'reissen, raffen, raufen, verwunden; rutschen, gleiten, fallen, stürzen.'

Wald. ratsken in im štrau rūme ratsken 'einen im Stroh herumwälzen' : rutsken 'rutschen.'

Bav. ratschen 'klappern, schnarren, schwatzen' : rutschen 'rutschen; schaukeln.'

176. N. rasa 'glide, rush about, play gaily; rage': rusa 'start ahead, go on chance or luck, barter by chance more than by valuation; storm ahead; work carelessly; shake, sway.'

176a. Thur. rascheln 'mit jemandem sich im Scherze rupfen': ruscheln 'rascheln; unordentlich; fahrig sein; auf dem Eise gleiten.'

177. S. rispa 'scratch, slip, rip': raspa 'rasp, scratch.'

D. rispe 'scratch': raspe 'rasp.'

Dutch rispen 'belch': raspen 'rasp, grate.'

Westf. rispeln 'rascheln': raspeln 'mit einer Raspel feilen': ruspeln 'vom Boden, der etwas gefriert : et ruspelt.'

Wald. rispelen 'regen rühren' : raspelen 'feilen rascheln.'

178. N.  $r\bar{\imath}la$  'walk with difficulty, unsurely; stagger,'  $r\bar{\jmath}la$  'hack, harrow, dream away the time, keep to oneself,' ryla 'howl, shriek with a long-drawn sound,' rilla 'roll small and light things, trundle, walk slowly':  $r\bar{e}la$  'twist a joint; walk shakily and unevenly, like a child,'  $r\varrho la$  'talk loud, screech, use big words; tumble, gambol,'  $r\varrho la$  'pierce, scratch; prate; walk slowly': rala 'walk slowly, talk wanderingly,' ralla 'talk much, prate':  $r\bar{\varrho}la$  'write carelessly, clutter,' rolla 'prate': rulla 'roll, walk swayingly and unsteadily.'

E. rill 'narrow stream,' reel 'stagger, sway': roll 'rollen.'

Dutch rillen 'shiver, shudder': rellen 'babble, tattle, chatter': ralle f. 'gossip': rollen 'roll, trundle; tumble': zooals het reilt en zeilt 'in the lump.'

Lux. Rill f. 'Rinne, Rinnstein': rallech 'wüst, roh': Roll f. 'Rolle; Bierwagen': Rull f. 'Saufgelage,' rullen 'rollen.'

179. E. dial. rickle 'rattle, jingle, chatter': dial. ruckle 'breathe with difficulty, make a hoarse rattling sound, croak.'

Bav. ricksen 'schäkern, sich scherzweise zanken': räckezen 'sich räuspern': ruckezen 'girren, jämmerlich bitten': rauckizen 'kläglich tun oder reden.'

180. N. riga 'totter, sway, sway lightly, rock, flit lightly, walk unsurely, walk slowly,' rigga 'rock, shake, take hold of something so that it shakes; wrap up,' rigla 'rock, stand loose or trembling, totter, walk unsurely, be loose in the joints, move quickly back and forth, rattle in the throat': regla 'prattle, talk maliciously; be incoherent': raga 'totter, waver, ramble,' ragga 'walk slowly like an old man, saunter, idle about,' ragla 'totter, reel; prattle; talk or write carelessly and meaninglessly, move unsteadily': rogga 'prompt, incite, hurry,' rogla 'play before the eye in changing colors': rugga 'tremble, shake, rock, move, swing, shudder,' rugla 'lie or stand unsurely, walk totteringly, waveringly.'

E. dial. riggle, wriggle 'zappeln; squirm; struggle; rattle': dial. raggle, wraggle 'wrangle, dispute, contend with': dial. ruggle 'shake, pull, tug backwards and forwards, shake so as make a rattling noise.'

181. N. gipa 'cause to open or gape; gasp': gapa 'gape, gazeat; rant, prate, shout': geipa 'set open, give a wide opening, straddle; throw about the arms or body; prattle, talk wantonly.'

Els. giffe 'schwache Laute ausstossen, wimmern' : gaffe 'stieren, starr ansehen.' Cf. also perhaps No. 181b. N.

181a. Groningen giebeln 'laugh' : gabbeln 'laugh,—louder than giebeln.'

OF.  $g\bar{\imath}beln$  'lachen, kichern, spottend u. höhnend lachen' : gabbeln 'mit weit geöffnetem Munde hell u. laut lachen' : gubbeln 'wallen, brodeln, brausen.'

Westf. gibbeln 'heimlich versteckt lachen' : gabbeln 'Spass haben.'

181b. N. gyfsa 'puff out air, pant out; jump up high, cause to jump up high': gafsa 'swallow forcedly, gulp down': gufsa 'puff, blow gently, come in puffs, prepare carelessly.'

E. dial. jiffle 'fidget, be restless, shuffle;' sb.—'idle talk': dial. jaffle sb. 'idle discourse': juffle 'beat, knock, box the ears; walk

hastily, shuffle.'

OF. gaffeln 'mit weit geöffnetem Munde hell u. laut lachen,= gabbeln' : guffeln 'anhaltend laut oder dumpf u. unterdrückt lachen.'

182. N. gimpa seg 'swing, shake, move, throw about the upper part of the body with gestures and grimaces; challenge or vex,' gimsa 'throw one's head wantonly, like a young horse': gampa seg 'act like a clumsy jester,' gamsa 'jest, joke, trifle, jest with stupid, gross grimaces': gumpa 'give a light blow with the clenched fist, puff; take food, eat,' gumsa 'laugh suppressedly, with small clucking outbursts.'

D. gamse 'snap': gumle 'mumble.'

J. gimpe 'shake, rock, twinge, sting (of sudden-pain),' gimre 'move tremblingly up and down': gamse 'snap': gumpe 'swing, rock on the arm,' gumse 'mumble.'

E. dial. gamp 'be foolishly merry, laugh loudly': dial. gump 'grope.'

182a. Els. gümple 'mit geringwertigen alten Sachen trödeln' : gample 'im Gehen sich hin u. herwiegen.'

Schw. gampe 'schwanken, schankeln,' gampele 'auspumpen': gumpere 'poltern.'

Bav. gampen, gampern 'scherzen, hüpfen, springen' : gumpen, gumpeln 'Sprünge machen, stossen, durch stossende Bewegung herauf herausbringen (von Wiederkäuern).'

183. Hess. gitzen 'einen leise pfeifenden Laut von sich geben (von Mäusen etc.)': gätzen 'schreien nach Legen eines Eis, gackern (von der Henne)': gutzen 'sich bücken, sich wiederlegen.' Cf. No. 183a.

183a. N. gidda 'tremble, shudder, vibrate': gadda 'stretch up, erect oneself; become hard or firm.'

Schw. gidere 'kichern, lachen,' güdere 'gurgelndes Geräusch verursachen, plappern': gadele, gadere 'schwatzen, plaudern.' Cf. No. 183 and Nos. 206, 206a.

184. N. gisa 'look with pinched-up eyes, blink, stare with sly, pretendedly penetrant mockery': gasa 'gaze, stare, strut, move about with one's nose in the air, be lively, rush ahead': gusa 'sigh, groan; hang back from a duty; rush forth': geisa 'stride, straddle.'

185. Thur. gillern 'schreien,' gillen 'laut kreischen': gallern 'mit Wucht werfen; durchprügeln': gullern 'geräuschvoll fliessen, giessen, trinken; das Wasser gullert aus der Flasche.'

Hess. gillern 'scharfer, hoher Ton des Schmerzenslautes der Hunde': gallern 'laut schreien, rufen, weinen, laut lachen.'

Bay. gellen 'schreien': gollen 'vomere.' Cf. No. 208.

185a. Groningen gilpen 'scream, whine': galpen 'howl very loudly, cry.'

OF. gilpen, gilpen 'laut u. scharf schreien; kreischen': galpen 'laut schreien, weinen, heulen, schelten': gulpen 'mit grossem Schwall hervorbrechen; in grossen Zügen hineinstürzen, gierig schlucken.'

Westf. gilpern 'schreien (von jungen Hühnern)': galpern 'schreien (vom Hunde, wohl auch vom Menschen).'

Wald. jilperen 'piepen, nach Futter schreien (von jungen Vögeln)': jalpern 'heulend bellen (von Hunden).'

Hess. gilpen 'schreien wie junge Vögel; winseln': gilfen 'laut, schreiend u. schnell reden': galpen 'bellen, zanken,' galfen 'bellen, zanken.' Cf. No. 208.

186. Hess. gerren (st., IV) 'weinen': gurren 'dumpf knurren oder knarren.'

Els. garre, gerre 'das R mit dem Zäpfchen aussprechen': gurre 'girren (von Tauben).' Cf. No. 209.

187. E. gargle: gurgle.

188. Hess.  $g\bar{\imath}ken$ , gicken 'laut u. hell, in hohem Tone aufschreien; mit langen stumpfen Instrumenten stechen' :  $g\bar{a}ken$  'überlaut schreien,' gackern 'gackern.'

Thur. gieken 'mit einem langen Gegenstande stechen; scharf sehen,' giekeln 'unsicher stechen,' gieksen 'stechen; laut schreien,'

gicken 'stechen, hell auflachen, schreien,' gickeln 'unsicher stechen, sticheln, reizen': gäken, gäksen 'sich erbrechen,' gäckeln 'unsicher herumfahren': gäcken, gacken 'lang hervortreten,' gacken 'schreien, gackern, schwatzen,' gaken 'lang u. dünn emporstehen; schreien.'

Bav. gigken 'mit der Spitze des Zeigefingers stechen, berühren, auf etwas hinweisen; unartikulierte Töne hervorbringen,' gigkeln 'beben, zucken': gögken 'rülpsen, speien, sich erbrechen': gagkern, gagkezen 'abgestossene Laute hervorbringen, trocken u. abgebrochen husten, stottern, aussprechen': gogkeln '(von Hahne) die Henne treten': gugken 'gucken.' Cf. Nos. 188a, 210.

188a. N. gigla 'shake, topple, be or keep in a gently swinging movement': gagla 'strut, stretch oneself upward, stare with one's chin in the air': gugla 'stammer': geigla 'swing, sway,

swing and throw oneself about.'

E. jig 'dance a clog-dance,' dial. 'dance briskly, play the fiddle, work in a lively manner, trot, move, jerk, tilt, shake,' giggle 'titter, laugh suppressedly,' dial. giggle, jiggle 'shake about, be restless, wriggle': dial. jag 'jerk roughly, jolt,' dial. jaggle 'cut roughly, shake, quarrel, jangle,' dial. gaggle 'laugh immoderately, cackle': jog 'push, nudge; shake,' dial. 'move on,' joggle 'shake, shove, nudge,' dial. 'move on slowly; throb, pulse': dial. juggle 'shake, joggle, mix violently,' dial. guggle 'gurgle, bubble; sound, gurgle, guzzle.'

Els. gagere 'gackern, schwatzen, heftig weinen; schaukeln, langsam gehen': gugere 'schaukeln, hin u. her schwanken.' Cf. especially No. 210.

188b. E. jingle 'ring lightly, tinkle': jangle 'ring noisily, 'sound out of tune.'

Els. Ginkel m. 'freischwebender, hängender Körper; Knabe, der beständig Sprünge macht': Gänkel m. 'tändelnder, närrischer Mensch': Gankel m. 'lose Weiberjacke': Gunkel m. 'Lump, Schnappssäufer.'

Note.—With words in gn- cf. also those in kn-.

189. E. gnab-, etc. see under n-.

Els. gnappe 'plötzlich in die Knie einsinken, den Fuss übertreten, hinken, schwanken' : gnuppe 'Rippenstösse geben.'

189a. OF. gniffeln, gniffellachen 'heimlich lachen; gekniffen, unterdrückt, mit kicherndem, feinem Tone lachen': gnuffeln 'i. q. gniffeln aber mit dumpferem, dem U-Laut entsprechendem Ton.'

190. N. gnidra 'rub perseveringly, rub clean; work unceasingly but with little result; toil, finger, make too small': gnadra 'grumble.'

D. gnidre 'write a close and crabbed hand' : gnadre 'grumble, growl.'

J. gnidder 'louse-egg; fine, illegible writing': gnaddre 'murmur, growl, grumble.'

E. qnat-, etc. see under n-.

OF. gnittern, knittern 'einen weinerlichen u. klagenden Ton hören lassen, knisternd rauschen, prasseln': gnattern, gnattern 'murren, verdriesslich sein': gnuttern, knuttern 'i. q. gnattern u. gnittern, aber mit dumpfem, dem U entsprechendem Ton.'

Thur. knittern 'in hellen, kurzen Tönen knacken, knattern': knattern 'unaufhörlich nörgeln, knurren, brummen': knuttern, knutteln 'brummen, murren.'

Stieg. knittern '= knātern in kurzen, hellen Tönen': knātern 'knarren, knacken,' knattern 'brummen, knurren (von Menschen), knattern (von Gewehrfeuer).' Cf. No. 214.

191. N. gnistra 'whine; creak, give a screeching sound': gnastra 'whine; grumble.'

J. gniske 'rub': gnaske 'gnaw gently, chew with a crackling sound.'

OF. gnīsen, knīsen 'knirschen, beissen, zischend flüstern, kichern': gnūsen, knūsen 'drücken, drückend zermalmen.'

Pr. knistern: knästern 'prasseln, knarren, rasseln. Der intensiv höhere Ton des Prasselns und Knarrens wird durch knistern bezeichnet.'

NHD. knistern: knastern. Cf. No. 215.

192. D. knirke 'creak, crackle (of snow)' : knarke 'creak, grate, jar' : knurre 'growl, snarl.'

F. gnierje, gnjirje 'mit den Zähnen kratzen; gnash the teeth': gnoarje 'knurren, murren.'

OF. gnīren, gniren 'knirren, einen feinen knarrenden Ton von

sich geben, knirschen, kreischen, wimmern, gnirsen 'knirschen, i. q. gnarsen u.  $gn\bar{u}rsen$ , 'jedoch mit feinerem Ton': gnarren 'knarren, murren, brummen, gnarsen 'knirschen (Zähne, Mühlsteine, Felsen)':  $gn\bar{u}ren$  'knurren, brummen, murren,  $gn\bar{u}rsen$  'i. q. gnarsen aber mit dumpferem dem U entsprechendem Ton.'

Wald. knaren 'weinen (von Kindern)' : knuren 'knurren,

Pr. gnirren, gnörren 'hämisch, mit Murmeln u. Zähnefletschen lachen; hohnlachen, murren, 'knirren 'feineres Knarren; knurren; = gnirren': gnarren, gnaren 'knarrend klagen, verdriesslich u. unzufrieden murren, 'knarren 'knarren; verdriesslich u. weinerlich murren': gnorren, gnurren 'knurren, murren, brummen, 'knorren = gnorren.

NHD. knirren: knarren: knurren.

Els. knirsche 'mit den Zähnen knirschen' : knarsche 'etwas Hartes kauend mit den Zähnen Geräusch machen.'

Schw. knirren 'knittern wie harter Schnee unter den Füssen': chnarsche 'knarren, knirschen': knorren 'grunzen,' chnorsche 'zusammendrücken, pressen, quetschen, kneten, häufig mit dem Nebenbegriff des Unordentlichen.'

193. N. glīpa (st. I) 'grab with the mouth, swallow,' glīpa glipa 'gape, be a little open (of clothes)': glapa 'have an open space that ought not be, gape': glaapa 'stare, look after something,' glopa 'gape, open one's mouth wide, become soft and swollen in thawing weather (of the earth); swallow; chance, stumble, let things go': glupa 'gape, snap up, tear to oneself, swallow': gleipa 'go on one's luck, loiter; distort one's face': gløypa 'swallow, eat greedily; talk roughly, grab at roughly.' Cf. No. 218.

193a. S. dial. glaffsa 'clack, clap (of shoes)': glaffsa 'eat voraciously; eat slowly and much': gluffsa 'devour carelessly and violently.'

194. N. glīma 'shine, flash, have blinding brilliancy (of the sun or snow); shine with an unsteady, blinding, usually a reflected light,' glima 'glitter, glisten; glint now and then,' glyma 'cast angry looks,' glymja 'resound, rattle': glama 'rattle, make a noise, bang; rail, rate, scold': glama 'stare, make big eyes':

gluma 'resound, more dully than glymja; grow dark, cloud over; cast sinister glances': gleima 'cast short, quick glances, look awry and stealthily': gløyma 'cast stealthy and crooked glances.'

S. glimma 'glimmer, glisten, glitter': glömma 'forget': glamma 'laugh and talk.'

D. glimre 'glitter, glisten' : glamme 'bay, bark' : glume 'forget.'

E. gleam, glim, glimmer : gloam : gloom, glum.

OF. glimmen 'glimmen, scheinen, glänzen' : glümen, glumen 'heimlich wonach sehen u. lauern, einen finstern, bösen Blick werfen' : glumen 'ein dumpfer, versteckter Schmerz.'

Wald. glimen 'glimmen': glumen 'einen stillen, dumpfen Schmerz empfinden (z. B. von nicht heftigem Zahnweh).'

Thur. glimmen, glimmern 'zitternd glänzen' : glimmen 'glimmen.'

Schw. glimse 'stark glimmen' : glumse 'unter der Asche brennen, noch glühen.'

195. N. glidra 'tremble so as to seem to give small glints (of eyes, of the air)': gladra 'treat carelessly and unhandily things that require care; bungle': glodra 'be fumbling and unsure in the use of the hands and feet, fumble or paw senselessly, rush ahead clumsily.'

Els. glitzere 'glänzen, funkeln, blinken; putzen' : glotze 'starr sehen.'

196. N. glīna (st. I) 'shine, have a white sheen,' glīna (wk.) 'stare': glæna 'grow pale': glana 'stare, look curiously, glimmer, shine (of open spaces between clouds, of the horizon after sunset)': glana 'grow more open and broader, stare, look, become more open (of a forest)': gleina 'look askance, cast angry looks, slide to one side, slide down.'

D. glinse 'glisten, shine' : glane 'stare.'

E. glint 'shine, sparkle, gleam, flash,' dial. 'peep; squirt': dial. glunt 'emit sparks, glance, pout, scowl.'

197. N. glisa 'flash, gleam through a small opening, show the teeth; titter, laugh mockingly': gløsa 'catch fire, blaze up, flash up, shine, glow, see, watch': glosa 'shine, sparkle, look after, see.'

198. N. glira 'blink, pinch together the eyes, glimmer, shine repeatedly, laugh with puckered eyes repeatedly and suppressedly,' glyra 'look intensely, look sidewise with an observant, angry, or arch glance, blink, stare': glera 'be childishly, noisily gay; jump about laughing and shouting; frisk, gambol': glora 'glisten, shine; make big eyes, stare.'

199. E. grip 'take hold of' : grapple 'clutch, close with' : grope 'feel for, fumble after or about' : gripe 'sieze, squeeze, give

pain.'

199a. E. dial. grib 'bite': grab 'sieze, take hold of': grub 'dig, dig around.'

F. grabbelje 'krabbeln, suchend tasten' : grobbelje 'waschen.' Groningen. gribbeln 'claw up, gather up small objects' : grōbbeln 'grope (in the dark).'

Wald. gripsen 'Sachen von geringem Werte stehlen, mausern':

grapsen 'hastig greifen.'

Lux. gripsen 'entwenden, stehlen' : grapsen 'hastig nach etwas greifen.'

Thur. gripsen 'stehlen': grapsen, grupsen 'hastig greifen.'

Stieg. jripsen 'heimlich fassen, greifen; stehlen': jrapschen 'mit vollen Händen greifen, raufen, an sich reissen.'

Els. grippe 'stehlen' : gruppe 'kauern, sich ducken.'

Schw. grapen 'tappen, tasten': grupen 'kriechen (von kleinen Kindern).' Cf. No. 223.

200. N. grimma seg 'get angry, act harshly' : gramma seg 'complain.'

F. grimmelje 'crawl, swarm': grommelje 'rumpeln, poltern, murren.'

WVI. grimmen, 'smile,' grimmelen 'curdle' : grimeelen, gremeelen, grameelen, 'smile,' grameien 'smile' : grommelen 'scold, mutter.'

OF. fergrimmen 'ergrimmen, wütend werden': gramen, grammen, grämen 'böse, verdriesslich sein, sich grämen': grummeln 'knurren; donnern.'

Westf. grīmen 'grauen, dämmern,' griemeln = grīmen : grāmstern 'hūsteln' : gramm adj. 'heiser' : grummeln 'leise donnern; sich klumpen.'

Hess. grammelig 'heiser': grummen, grummeln, grumsen 'knurren, brummen, in den Bart brummeln.'

NHD. Grimm: Gram.

Els. grimme 'mit den Nageln kneifen' : gramsle 'krabbeln, durcheinanderwimmeln; in allen Gliedern prickeln' : grumme 'brummen, murren, murmeln; kneifen,' grumse 'murren, brummen; grunzen.'

Bav. grimmen 'kneipen, zwicken': gramen, grameln 'die Zähne hörbar übereinander reiben, knirren, knirschen': grumen 'sich bekümmern, grämen.'

201. OF. grillen 'frösteln, zittern' : grölen 'gröhlen, laut schreien, brüllen, laut u. mistönig singen, etc.' : gralen, grälen 'laut u. fröhlich lachen, freudig wiehern' : grullen 'grollen, böse sein, brummen, donnern.'

Westf. grille f. 'Wut, Zorn' : graelen 'mistönend schreien' : grullen 'leise donnern, grollen.'

NHD. Grille: Groll.

Bav. grillen, grellen 'brüllen, heulend weinen' : grollen 'brüllen, brummen.' Cf. No. 229.

202. N. jabba 'talk after, assent to everything; talk overflowingly and meaninglessly; stammer; trot, run, be slow, chew slowly and without force': jubba 'bend down low.'

Lux. jappelen 'traben' : juppelen 'schaukeln, hüpfen.'

Thur. jippen 'schnappen': jappen 'mit Mühe atmen.' 203. N. jagla 'chew laboriously, cut bluntly; creak; stand

shaking, set loosely and high up; prate, talk nonsense': jugla 'walk hobblingly, shakingly with the knees turned out; play tricks, talk nonsense.'

Westf. jackeln, jackeln 'reiten': juekeln, juckeln 'reiten, schlecht reiten.'

Wald. jikselen 'zwischen Schritt u. Trab reiten' : jakelen 'im Trabe reiten' : jukelen = jakelen.

Lux. jickelen 'beweglich sein' : jekelen 'unruhig sein, besonders mit den Beinen beim Sitzen' : juckelen = jickelen.

Hess. jackern 'schnell reiten, schnell fahren': juckern 'unruhig sitzen; auch = jackern.'

Els. jackere 'jagen, eilig fahren, schnell reiten; im Haus

herumsurren und arbeiten': jucke 'zucken, zusammenfahren, aufspringen; jucken, reiben, sich kratzen.'

204. N. kippa 'pull to oneself, snap, nip; scare, startle': kappa 'take off the top, hew off': kafsa 'snatch, claw, move the hands much, pluck, pick, or stir at': kufsa 'make sudden jerks, go suddenly from one thing to another, hustle.'

E. chip 'cut into small pieces, diminish by cutting away a little at a time,' dial. 'crack, break the shell (of birds)': chap 'cut, crack,' dial. 'knock, strike, chop': chop 'cut with a blow, cut into small pieces,' dial. 'thrash, beat, break small; put, thrust.'

OF. kippe, kip 'Spitze, scharfe Kante': kappe, kap 'Kopf-

decke, Deckel, Endrinde des Brodes': kop 'Kopf.'

Westf. kippen 'schwach anstossen,' kipp m. n. 'Spitze': kappe f. Mütze, Haube, Fingerkuppe': kopp m. 'Kopf, Bergkuppe.'

Wald. kipen 'umschlagen, umfallen; beschneiden, behauen' : kapen 'abhauen, bestutzen.'

Stieg. kippen 'umfallen, umstürzen, umwenden,' kippeln 'schwanken, zu fallen drohen (von kleineren Dingen gesagt),' kippe f. 'Spitze, Schwerpunkt': kuppe f. 'Spitze, Gipfel, runder oberster Teil': kaipeln 'wanken, hin u. her schwanken.'

Els. kipf m. 'langer spitzer Wecken': kopf m. 'Kopf.'

204a. N. kabba 'take off the top, hew off; cause to fall, conquer': kubba 'hew off into short stumps.'

S. dial. kabba 'hew off; take to oneself': kubba 'hew off to short stubs.'

Dutch kibbelen 'quarrel, wrangle, cavil' : kabbelen 'prattle, murmur, gabble.'

Westf. kābbeln 'keifen': kubben 'im Staube arbeiten oder spielen,' kuebeln 'sich im Staube wälzen (von Hühnern),' kubbelik 'kränkelnd, fieberfröstelnd.'

Els. kippe 'die äusserste Spitze abbrechen,' kipp f. 'Gipfel des Baumes, Kopf': kappe 'die Spitze abschneiden (an den Reben); auf eine Anzahl im Kreise aufrechtstehender Garben zum Schutze eine umgekehrt aufsetzen,' kapp f. 'Mütze, Lappen': kuppe 'die aüsserste Spitze abrechen.'

205. Dutch kim f. 'border, brim, mould, horizon': kom f. 'bowl, cup, pond, basin.'

WVl. kemme, kimme, kem f. 'horizon': komme f., kom m. 'a rather deep earthen, wooden, or metal vessel.'

OF. kimme, kim 'Kerbe, Rinne, Einschnitt, Rand': kumme, kum 'tiefe Schüssel, Becken, tiefes u. hohles Etwas.'

Pr. kimme f. 'am Fasse, der über den Boden hinausragende Rand der Dauben; am Schiffe, der äusserste Rand': kumme, komme f. 'tiefes, schüsselartiges Gefäss; Napf.; kleine runde Bowle; Krippe, Kasten.'

206. E. dial. chitter 'twitter, warble': chatter 'prattle, talk,' dial. 'scold, rattle': dial. chuttering 'a subdued chirping.'

OF. kittern 'leise oder fein und scharf schallen, knistern, zwitschern': kettern 'schelten, lärmen, toben': kattern 'lärmen, plaudern, knattern.'

Thur. kittern 'lachen, kichern': kutteln 'schlecht, oberflächlich waschen.'

Cf. No. 206a and Nos. 183 and 183a.

206a. N. kada 'cackle, chatter, jabber': koda 'be busy at small things, bustle, gossip, talk small-talk, chatter.'

Westf. käddern 'zanken': kuedern 'klagen, sich krank zeigen,' kuedeln 'sich im Staube wälzen (von Hühnern).'

Els. kittere 'girren, kichern' : kottere 'lachen; singen (von der Nachtigall).'

Schw. chittere 'kichern, garrire (wie die Vögel),' chüttere 'garrire (wie die Vögel), laut lachen, verliebt reden,' chüttele 'wie ein Rebhuhn rufen, heimlich raunen': chuttere, chütere 'vom schnarrenden Laut, den der Täuberich oder Hahn hören lässt, wenn er das Weibchen ruft,' chüte 'tosen, rauschen, heulen, keuchen.'

Bav. kittern 'in schlecht verhaltenen Soprantönen lachen': küdern, ködern 'in wiederholtes halbverhaltenes Lachen ausbrechen; schäkern': kuttern 'ein Geräusch machen, wie Flüssigkeiten, die aus der Flasche gegossen werden; halbunterdrückt lachen,' kudern = kuttern.

Cf. No. 206 and Nos. 183 and 183 a.

207. Els. kistere 'heiser reden, keuchen, pusten' : kustere 'grübeln.'

207a. Schw. chisle 'hageln, rieseln, in Kiesel zerfallen': chosle

'unangenehme Arbeit verrichten; im Essen u. Trinken unsauber sein; menstruare; durcheinander regnen u. schneien.'

208. Groningen kilstern 'call loud and shrilly, outscream': kallen 'prate, boast': kullen 'cheat, mislead.'

Dutch killen 'shiver with cold, be chilled, tingle': kallen 'prattle, gossip': kollen 'knock down, slaughter, ride upon': kullen 'cheat, dupe.'

OF. killen 'wappern, schnappern, flattern, hin u. herschlagen (von Segeln)': kallen 'sprechen, schwatzen, plaudern': kullern, kullen 'rumoren, poltern; dumpfes, rollendes Geräusch machen; rollen, wälzen': kil-kallen = kallen.

Bav. kallen 'bellen, sprechen (verächtlich)' : kollern, kullern 'rollen, kugeln.'

Cf. Nos. 185, 185a.

209. N. kirra 'tremble, shudder': karra 'coo, cackle, speak uvular R; ruffle, shrivel': kurra 'give a cooing sound; let (a meal) settle in the stomach.'

Pr. kirren, kürren 'tönen, erschallen; bändigen, zahm machen': kurren 'knurren, murren.'

Stieg. kår'm 'klagen, jammern': kurrig 'leicht auffahrend, reizbar, erregbar.'

Schw. chirre 'einen knarrenden Ton von sich geben, mit den Zähnen knirschen, girren, hörbar atmen, husten': churre 'knurren, brummen, murren; schwer und hörbar atmen.'

Bav. kirren, kerren 'durchdringend schreien oder tönen': karren 'knarren.' Cf. No. 186.

210. N. kikla 'strain by driving too hard; give small pushes and twists, walk bobbingly and unevenly,' kiksa 'rub back and forth, especially of playing the fiddle': kjekla 'quarrel, wrangle': kakla 'hack, beat, bang, clatter in walking, row ineffectively,' kaksa 'hack, hew, or cut clumsily; slap, thump': kokla 'cackle; spoil, coddle': kukla 'cluck; mutter; botch, boggle; caress,' kuksa 'tumble about as if drunk or wild; deck oneself.'

D. kike, kige 'peep,' kikse 'miss, make a miss' : kagle 'cackle.'

E. kick 'push with the foot,' dial. 'sting, tease; complain': dial. cack 'cackle, chatter, boast,' cackle: dial. cock 'crow, swagger; turn up, raise': dial. cuck 'throw, jerk, lurch.'

F. kikke 'make the least sound,' kikkerje 'croak like a frog': kokke, kokkelje 'cluck, cackle.'

Dutch kikken 'mutter; in hij durft geen woord kikken': kakelen 'cackle, cluck; chatter, tattle, gabble; scribble': kokkelen 'cluck': koekeloeren 'stare, ogle; idle, loiter': kijken 'look, peep.'

Westf.  $k\bar{\imath}ken$  (st. I) 'gucken, sehen,' kicken 'mucksen, leisen Laut hören lassen': kaekeln 'grelles entgegensprechen':  $k\bar{\imath}keln$  'schwatzen, schnattern,' kackeln 'gackern':  $k\bar{\imath}ken$  'keuchen, kränkeln; gucken.'

Wald.  $k\bar{\imath}ken$ ,  $k\bar{\imath}kelen$  'gucken':  $k\bar{a}ken$  'schreien, weinen (meist von Tieren)': kuken 'sehen.'

Siebenb. kickn 'stechen': kuckn 'gucken.'

Schw. Chīch m. 'keuchender Atemzug; Rauhreif': Chuch m. 'Hauch, Atem.'

Bav. kickeln 'spottend mit dem Finger auf etwas hinweisen,' kickezen 'kichern, husten, abgestossene Laute hervorbringen,' kicken, kecken 'sich erholen, beleben': kocken 'sich unruhig bewegen.' Cf. especially No. 188.

211. S. dial. kinka 'be over-sensitive, vexatious; ring the smallest church-bells; dangle': kanka 'walk slowly.'

E. dial. chink 'catch one's breath in laughing or coughing': dial. chank 'chew, bite': dial. chunk sb. 'log of wood, lump.'

Dutch kinken 'peg, beat repeatedly': konkelen 'gossip; bungle, botch; intrigue, plot,' konkel f. 'rag, tatter, dishcloth; slut, hussy.'

OF. kinken (st.) 'klingen; schnurren, husten; schlagen, stossen,' kinkel, kinke, kink, Schlinge, Windung, Ringel': kunkeln 'schwatzen, plaudern; flüstern, munkeln,' kunkel 'Schmutzlappen, Schlumpe, Vettel.'

Note.—For words in kn- see also under gn-.

212. E. knap- etc., see under nap-.

F. knippe 'clip, cut, fillip, catch; crush (lice),' knipe 'pinch, nip, quiz': knappe 'snap, crack, burst, chatter, crackle': knop m. 'pommel, head, bud, knob.'

Groningen knippen 'snap one's fingers,' kniepen 'be in a pinch, exert oneself': knappen 'crack (nuts).'

Dutch knippen 'clip, cut, fillip, catch, crush, (lice)': knappen

'snap, crack, burst, chatter, crackle': knoppen 'bud,' knop m. 'pommel, head, bud, knob': knijpen 'pinch, nip, oppress, quiz.'

WVl. knippen 'jump away with a snap, fall suddenly':

knappen 'snatch, snap at, bite noisily.'

OF. knippen 'knippen, knicken, platzen, knicken, blinzeln, zwinkern, schnellen, 'knüppen 'knüpfen,' knīpen (st.) 'kneifen': knappen 'knallen, platzen, brechen, essen, spalten.'

Westf. knippen 'schnellen, schussern, Schnippehen schlagen,' knüppen 'knüppen 'knüppen 'knopen 'knopen

kleiner Hügel' knoppe f. 'Knospe.'

Wald. knipsen 'mit den Fingern schnalzen, mit den Augen zwinkern': knupsen 'puffen, stossen.'

Pr. knippen, knöppen 'knupfen, mit hörbarem Knipp schliessen': knappen 'knapp austeilen; mit der Peitsche knallen.'

Bav. kniffen, kniffeln 'reiben, kauen, kratzen, zerren, reissen': knuffen 'mit den Knöcheln der Faust stossen, schlagen': kneifen 'antreiben; bellen (von kleinen Hunden)': knaufen 'bellen, zanken.'

212a. N. knabba 'snatch quickly': knubba 'push, puff, buffet.' E. knab- etc., see under n-.

F. knibbelje 'haggle, cavil': knabbelje, knabje 'nibble, gnaw, champ': knobbel 'knob, protuberance.'

Dutch knibbelen 'haggle, higgle, cavil': knabbelen 'nibble, gnaw, champ': knobbel, knubbel 'knob, protuberance.'

Westf. knibbeln 'abkneipen; zwinkern,' knibschen 'wegschnellen': knabbeln 'nagen': knubbeln 'zerdrücken, faltig machen,' knubbel, knubben m. 'Knoten, Klumpen, Geschwulst.'

Els. knabbere 'kauen, mit Mühe zerbeissen': knopere 'schelten, murren': knuppere 'schlecht nähen, knicken.'

Bav. knappen 'eine kurze Bewegung, besonders auf-u. niederwärts, machen; knapp zureichen': knuppeln 'mechanisch die Lippen bewegen, als ob sie sögen': knaupen = knappen.

E. knat- etc., see under n-.

213. N. knaska 'crunch, chew audibly': knuska 'crush, break, squeeze, oppress.'

Wald. knatsken 'quetschen, zerdrücken, unreifes Obst zerbeissen': knutskelen, knutsken 'verdrücken, liebkosend drücken.'

Hess. knitschen 'gänzlich zerdrücken (Kleider, Flöhe, Läuse),—abermalige Verstärkung von knetschen': knetschen'=knatschen, aber nicht blos von weichen Gegenständen gebraucht, zerquetschen,—eine Verstärkung von knatschen': knutschen 'in geringe Falten drücken, derb liebkosen,—eine Milderung des knetschen.'

Stieg.  $kn\bar{e}tschen$  'zerdrücken, zerpressen, zusammendrücken, pressen (Papier, Zeug, Kräuter)': knatschen 'in flüssige breiige Massen treten, etwas zu einer solchen treten, langweilig kritteln':  $kn\bar{u}tschen = kn\bar{e}tschen$ .

Schw. chnütsche 'zermalmen, zerreiben, prügeln, anhaltend trocken husten': chnatsche 'einen quatschenden, platschenden, knackenden Ton hören lassen': chnötsche 'beim Gehen schwer auftreten,= chnatsche meist mit dem Nebenbegriff der Unordentlichkeit': chnautsche 'in Kot stampfend, in Obst beissend klappern, plappern, schwatzen; besonders, mit starker Mundbewegung kauen.'

214. N. knidra 'work perseveringly but with little result, toil': knadra 'push and jolt over rough places (as on a frozen road).' Cf. especially gnad- etc., No. 190.

215. N. knisa 'snicker,' knisla 'whinny gently': knasa 'crush, crackle, sound as when something is crushed,' knasla 'chew rapidly, with open mouth, and audibly; crackle like something dry': knusa '= knasa; also, pinch, be stingy, haggle,' knusla 'rattle with a very low sound; pinch, be stingy, haggle.' Cf. No. 191.

215a. N. knispa 'eat brittle things slowly and all the time; eat rapidly': knaspa 'eat rapidly and audibly, gnaw rapidly at something hard': knuspa 'crush rapidly and audibly with lively movement of the jaws—the movements are less and lighter, the thing more breakable and the sound more dampened than in knaspa; go lightly to many small pieces with no high sound of breaking.'

216. Dutch *knellen* 'pinch, squeeze, oppress': *knallen* 'clap, crack, give a report': *knol* m. 'knob, protuberance, clumsy fellow': *knul* m. 'dunce; hammer.'

WVl. knollen 'grumble, scold' : knullen 'sing or speak with closed mouth, mumble.'

OF. knillen 'knistern, knisternd heftig brennen; zerknittern': knellen 'kneifen, klemmen, drücken': knallen 'knallen, mit der Peitsche schlagen, schiessen': knullen 'laut schwatzen, prahlen; knittern, drücken.'

Bav. knellen 'knallen, lärmen,' knöllen 'stossen, schlagen, puffen': knallen = knellen.

217. N. knikra 'laugh constantly, whinnyingly' : knaka 'crackle as when branches are broken or twisted' :  $kn\bar{u}ka$  'treat with the knuckles; squeeze, thrash.'

E. knak- etc., see under n-.

Dutch knikken 'crack, snap; crush (a louse); nod': knakken 'break, crack, injure with pain': knakkel m. 'knuckle.'

OF. knikken 'brechen; so brechen oder bersten, dass noch ein Zusammenhang bleibt': knakken (st. VI) 'knacken, krachen; brechen, bersten.'

Westf. knicken 'knicken, krümmen; brechen': knöken 'stossen, zerstossen': knucks 'innere Verletzung.'

Wald. kniken 'halb abbrechen' : knaken 'bersten, springen; zerbrechen, zersprengen.'

Pr. knicken 'mit gelindem Geräusch zu brechen anfangen,' knicksen 'brechen, wenn der das Brechen anzeigende Ton kurz ist; den volleren Ton bei einem Bruche bezeichnet knacken': knacken, knacksen 'rauschend knistern, als solle ein Bruch erfolgen.'

NHD. knicken: knacken.

Bav. kneckeln 'am Preise abbrechen, karg tun': knackern 'wiederholt knacken': knocken 'knieend sitzen, hocken': knucken 'stossen u. dadurch verletzen': knoukeln 'schlecht gehen.'

218. N. klippa 'clip, cut,' klipsa 'snap, catch at': kleppa 'hack, split, cleave; hang in clumps': klappa 'clap, beat with the flat hand; give a gentle, friendly slap,' klapsa 'hit repeatedly with something flat, slap': kloppa 'place wood over a swamp so as to make a road.'

S. klippa 'cut, snip, clip': dial. klappa 'throw out a word about something, be unable to keep silent': klappa 'clap, knock, rap,' dial. 'beat, bang, strike': klapa 'bungle.'

D. klippe 'clip, cut' : klapre 'clatter, rattle, chatter.'

E. clip 'cut with the scissors, snip': clap 'slap, strike with something flat'

F. klippe 'clap, chime, toll': klappe 'clap, smack, slap; chatter, babble; blab; crackle': klopje 'beat, knock, drub, plane, hammer.'

Dutch kleppen 'clap; chime, toll': klappen 'clap, smack, slap; chatter, prate, babble; blab; crackle': kloppen 'beat, knock, drub, hammer.'

OF. klippen 'durch Schlagen, Stossen, etc., ein klippendes oder klimperndes Geräusch machen': kleppen 'klappen; aufschlagen, dass es schallt, die Glocke mit dem Klöppel anschlagen, klepen, kläpen, klapen 'schlagen, klopfen, dreschen': klappen 'klappen 'klappen, klatschen, schlagen': kloppen 'klopfen, hämmern, pulsieren.'

Westf. klippern 'ein deminutives Klappern, heller als klappern': kleppen 'die Glocke anschlagen': klappen 'schlagen,' klappern 'klappern 'klappern 'Schläge geben': kloppen 'klopfen': kluppern 'mit derben Schuhen sehr hörbare Tritte machen.'

Pr. klippern 'klappern, doch mit leiserem Geräusch bei höherer Tonlage' : klappern 'wiederholt klappen.'

Thur. klippern 'mit hellem Ton klappern, klopfen' : klappern 'klappern.'

Els. klepfe 'knallen, besonders mit der Peitsche, schnellen, mit der Zunge oder dem Mittelfinger; krachen, pedere, schiessen; wegschnappen': klopfe 'schlagen, zerbrechen, prügeln.' Cf. No. 193.

219. N. klama 'work with difficulty, owing to external hindrances, toil,' klamra 'make a noise, clamor, dispute; work unhandily, slowly, with difficulty, owing to external impediments such as poor tools,—which does not presuppose clumsiness on the part of the worker,' klamsa 'botch, bungle, work awkwardly and with much noise': kluma 'make speechless; lame, bind to the spot,' klumra 'work with stiff, or, as it were, half-lamed hands; botch, 'klumsa 'make speechless, paralyze the tongue, keep from biting.'

219a. D. klimpre 'thrum, strum, twang' : klampe 'clamp, cleat.'

E. dial. climp 'take hold of suddenly, catch by a quick movement, steal, pilfer; mark with greasy fingers; limp, halt': clamp 'cleat, hold with instruments for the purpose,' dial. 'walk with heavy or noisy tread, stump about, stamp,' clamper 'make a clattering noise.': clump 'walk noisily.'

OF. klimpern 'klimpern, klirren, klittern, klingeln, stümperhaft spielen': klampen 'nageln, nieten, schlagen, festschlagen': klumpen, klumpern 'zu Klumpen ballen, poltern; mit dumpf

polterndem Geräusch, plump, schwer und laut gehen.'

Westf. klimperklain 'ausserst klein' : klumpen pl. 'Holzschuhe.'

219b. Els. klimpere 'lärmen, rasseln; schlecht auf einem Instrument spielen': klumpere 'in Holzschuhen lärmend gehen.'

220. N. klatra 'beat, hammer slowly and persistently on something hard; bungle; work with inconvenient materials or bad tools': klutra 'work at something small, be busy with small or easy work.'

E. dial. clitter 'litter, make a mess, flutter,' sb. 'clatter, confusion, the chirping of sparrows': clatter 'rattle, beat': dial. clutter 'pile up in heaps, fall in a heap,' clutter up 'litter, make a mess, bustle, do anything in confused, hasty manner': clitter-clatter sb. 'rattling noise, chatter,' vb. 'make a sharp rattling noise, talk a great deal.'

WVl. klatteren 'stain, spot, blot,' klutteren 'shake or toss with rattling.'

OF. klittern 'klirren, rasseln (Gläser, Metallstücke, ans Fenster schlagender Hagel), 'klütern 'in dilettantischer u. kleinlicher Weise arbeiten, flicken': klötern 'rasseln, klappern, klimpern (Küken im Ei, Bohnen in der Schote)': klatern, klattern 'klappern, rasseln, prasseln (Hagel, Regen, prasselnder oder schmetternder Donner)': klutern 'klumpig u. klössig werden.'

220a. Schw. chlättere 'klirren, klimpern': chluttere 'kleine Arbeit machen, flicken, klecken, schlecht schreiben; zittern; einen dumpfen, kollernden Ton aus dem Halse hören lassen.'

220b. N. klissa 'clash, clap': klessa 'stick to, hang to, splash, clap, clash, give a dull sound as when one heavy mass hits another; pet; speak unclearly': klassa 'stick, hang to; dabble,

soil, botch, bungle, talk unclearly': klussa 'soil, speak indistinctly': kleisa 'stick, speak unclearly.'

Dutch *kletsen* 'clash, slap, clap, lash': *klotsen* 'clash, knock': *klutsen* 'beat up (eggs, cream, etc.).'

OF. klits 'Schlag, Klapps,—ein feineres Geräusch wie klats': klats 'lauter Schall oder Knall, klatschender Schlag mit Hand oder Peitsche': klots 'Klotz, plumper oder dummer Mensch.'

Thur. klitschen 'mit hellem Tone klatschen, schlagen; Kalk an die Wand werfen, Butter aufs Brot werfen': klatschen 'schallend schlagen (auch besonders vom schallenden Niederschlagen der Regentropfen,' sich klatschen 'kämpfen, schwatzen.'

221. N. klandra 'complain, have an objection, work clumsily and with difficulty': klundra 'toil forward with difficulty; work clumsily, with poor instruments.'

OF. klinstern 'klimpern, klingeln, ein helltönendes Geräusch machen': kluntern 'poltern, geräuschvoll gehen; plump auftreten, stolpern.'

222. N. klikka 'hit with a small sound, tick like a watch, smack, click,' klykkja 'toll a bell, ring gently': klekka (st. e-a-o) 'blink, click; tremble, shudder; be sufficient,' kløkka 'tremble, move; be suddenly moved, be touched': klakka 'soil, spot, beat, bang, smack, snap': klukka 'whimper, complain with half-spoken complaints; cluck.'

D. klik (c.) 'blot, stain, blemish; miss-fire': klak, klakke (c.) 'blot': klokke (c.) 'clock, bell': kluk (c.) 'clucking.'

E. click 'hit lightly, make a slight noise,' dial. 'close, snap': clack 'clatter, resound, echo, snap the fingers': dial. clock 'cluck': cluck (of hens).

Dutch klikken 'tell tales, blab; suffice, be enough;' klieken 'spit, sputter out, leave scraps': klakken 'spoil, blot, dirty; crack': klokken 'cluck; gurgle; tipple, drink': kloeken 'encourage': klikklakken 'click, clash, clack, clang.'

WVl. klikken 'click, clap—(of something smaller than klakken)': klakken 'beat, strike with the whip so as to produce a smack': klokken 'drink from a bottle held to the mouth.'

OF. klikken 'durch Schlagen, Stossen, Hämmern, etc., ein feines, kurzes u. scharfes Geräusch machen': klakken 'klappern,

klappend schlagen, flecken, beklecksen, schmieren': klukken 'klucken, glucksen, schlucken, klopfen, pulsieren.'

Lux. kleken 'einen Knall machen, knicken, ein Patschhandchen geben, Beifall klatschen': kläken 'klatschen, knallen': klucken 'glucksen.'

Siebenb. klackn' pulsieren (von Wunden)': klucksn' glucksen.' Stieg. klickern 'bedeutet dasselbe wie klackern, nur für den hellern Ton des Fallens u. kleinere, feinere Teilchen': klackern 'in Klecksen etwas zerstreuen, so dass es schallt, klackt.'

Bav. klicken, klecken 'mit der Peitsche knallen, bersten, brechen': klöcken, klocken 'anklopfen': klocken, klucken 'anstossen, anprallen, hacken, schallen.'

222a. N. klinka 'clinch, rivet, clink glasses, hammer from both sides, beat or punch against': klunka 'cluck, gulp, croak.'

D. klinke 'rivet, clinch, clink glasses,' klynke 'whimper, whine': klunke 'cluck, gurgle.'

E. clink: clank 'rattle (of metal),' dial. 'strike with noise, beat, seat oneself noisily, take hold of noisily': dial. clunk 'emit a hollow interrupted sound, as of a liquid issuing from a bottle or narrow opening; hiccup; swallow, bolt.'

Pr. klunkern 'das kluckende, gluckende Tönen, welches sich beim Trinken aus einer Flasche mit engerem Halse hören lässt; auch das Rollen im Unterleibe': klinkklank 'Interjektion, gebraucht wenn ein Glas zur Erde fällt u. klingend zerbricht.'

223. F. kribelje 'jucken, kitzeln' : krabbelje 'scratch, scrape, scrawl' : kribbelkrabbel 'schlechte Schrift.'

D. kribben 'quarrel, be peevish, be cross; ail,' kribbeln 'scrawl, scribble, quarrel, be quarrelsome,' kriebelen 'scrawl, scribble': krabben 'scratch, claw; pencil,' krabbelen 'scratch, scrape, scrawl.'

WVl. kriebelen 'tingle, itch, prick': doorkrabbelen 'scratch or plow open completely.'

OF. kribben 'hadern, streiten, reizen,' kribbeln 'kritzeln, krabbeln, wimmeln': krabben 'kratzen, scharren, schlagen,' krabbeln 'krabbeln, kratzen, kitzeln, jucken.'

Westf. kribbeln 'reizen': krabbeln 'kriechen, krauen, kratzen.' Wald. kriwelen 'jucken, namentlich infolge von Frost': krawelen 'kriechen; sich lebhaft bewegen; krauen, kratzen.'

Pr. kribbeln, krebbeln 'ein kleines Krabbeln, krabbelnd sich regen; prickelnd jucken': krabbeln 'die Finger, Klauen, etc., krümmen zum Greifen, Klauen, Wühlen, Kratzen; langsam kriechen oder gehen.'

Moselfr. Siebenb. kribbelich 'murrisch, verdriesslich, launisch': krabbelen 'kriechen.'

Thur. kribeln 'jucken, vielfüssig sich bewegen': krabeln 'krauen, kitzeln.'

Stieg. kriweln 'vielfüssig sich bewegen, jucken': kraweln 'mit rascher Bewegung der Finger woran tasten, greifen, kratzen; die Füsse rasch bewegend kriechen besonders von vielfüssigen, kleinen u. zahlreichen Tieren.'

Schw. chrible 'mit einem spitzen Instrument die Oberfläche eines Körpers ritzen, mit allzu dünnen und krummen Strichen schreiben; zappeln': chrable 'krabblen, kratzen, tasten, herumstochern.'

224. N. krafsa, 'snatch, grab after; move the hands much': krufsa 'walk slowly and weakly, like a sick person.'

225. N. krimsa 'make figures, embroider, cut out': kramsa 'grab, snatch, fumble': krumsa 'knead, squeeze, treat with the knuckles.'

226. N. kritla 'tickle, itch, swarm with small creatures': kratla 'bungle, work without getting ahead': krutla 'work slowly and slackly.'

Dutch krissen 'crackle': krassen 'scratch, scrape; clean, scrape out; crack; screech, spatter (of pens), strum.'

NHD. kritzeln: kratzen.

Els. kritze 'ritzen, kritzeln, leicht kratzen, mit den Zähnen knirschen': kratze 'kratzen, reiben, radieren, schlagen, Zäpfchen -R sprechen.'

Schw. chritze 'ritzen, zeichnen; kratzen (von saurem Wein)': chratze 'kratzen, krauen, scharren.'

Bav. kritzen, kritzeln 'kritzen, kritzeln; mit feiner Stimme schreien': kratzen 'kratzen': verkrotzen 'im Zuschneiden verunstalten.'

227. N. krasla 'move ahead slowly and with difficulty': krusla 'move ahead slowly and somewhat waveringly owing to weakness or over-carefulness, work one's way ahead.'

228. E. dial. crish 'crush,' creesh 'grease, lubricate; beat': crash 'make a noise as of things breaking,' dial. 'break to pieces with violence and noise, smash': crush 'break and bruise, crowd, press, rumple.'

229. N. krīla 'tickle, itch; move so as to tickle or itch': krala 'claw, scratch, scrape': krōla 'scratch, work one's way laboriously,

crawl.' Cf. No. 201.

230. N. krikla 'make crooked figures, embroider in crooked lines': krekla 'stir up a quarrel; creep, crawl': krakla 'crawl ahead, work one's way ahead laboriously': krukla 'walk with bent or stiff limbs, walk laboriously and unsurely.'

E. creak, dial. crick 'wrench, twist, break, crack': dial. crake 'cry out harshly, croak, murmur, whimper; brag, boast, creak': crack: croak: dial. cruck 'to lame,' dial. cruckle 'crouch, bend,

hobble, make a cracking noise, wrinkle, rumple.'

Dutch kriek f. 'cricket; black-cherry; hunchback': kreuken 'fold, rumple,' krekel m. 'cricket, cicada, harvest-fly': kraken 'crack, crash': kroken 'fold, ruffle, rumple, pucker': krukken 'use crutches; be sickly', kruk f. 'crutch, handle, pommel,' m. 'bungler, blunderer; sickly person.'

WVI. kraken 'crack, crash' : krokken 'of the crumpling of

snow under foot.'

OF. krīken, kriken, kreken 'das Anbrechen des Tages': krōken 'brechen, krümmen; kränken': kraken 'krachen knacken, zerbrechen; mit knarrender oder krähender Stimme weinen; stöhnen,' krakeln 'gelinde krachen oder knarren.'

Westf. kricken 'krachen', krickeln 'kränkeln': kröckeln 'schwach, locker in den Fugen sein,' kräkeln 'stets Recht haben wollen und deshalb andern immer widersprechen': krucken 'keuchen, stöhnen, mit dem Leibe drücken.'

Wald. krikelech 'schlecht geschrieben': krakelech 'schief u. krumm': krikelkrakel n. 'schlechtes Geschreibse.'

Thur. kriekeln 'kritzeln' : krakeln 'lallen, gackern, glucken' : krakeln 'unleserlich schreiben, breitspurig gehen.'

Bav. kräcken, krecken 'krachen, verrenken' : krackeln 'zanken, streiten' : krucken 'mühsam gehen.'

230a. E. dial. crink 'twist, wrench painfully, bend, wrinkle;

loiter,' dial. crinch 'crunch with the teeth some hard or brittle substance; gnash': dial. crank 'make a harsh noise, creak, croak,' cranch 'crunch, grind with the teeth in biting anything hard; crush under foot; break up with a crackling sound': dial. cronk 'croak, grumble': crunch 'crush with the teeth.'

230b. Schw. chringle 'verschlingen; klirren, klingen' : chrangle 'sich winden, zusammenrollen; verwirren; sich weigern; zudringlich klagen; zanken, streiten.'

231. E. quiver 'shake with slight tremulous motion': quaver 'shake, sing or play with tremulous modulation,' dial. 'reel, tremble, go uncertainly about an occupation; brandish, flourish, clench the fists.' Cf. No. 242a.

232. OF. kwittern 'einen leisen oder feinen und scharfen Ton hören lassen, knistern, knittern, zwitschern': kwattern 'schwatzen, plaudern, zwitschern (Staar).'

Hess. quittern 'glänzen, leuchten' : quattern 'strudeln,' quatteln 'ein kochendes Geräusch von sich gehen.'

232a. Pr. quitschen 'quetschen; in hohen Tönen hell schreien; pfeifend u. quiekend mit kindischer Stimme sprechen': quatschen 'zur Bezeichnung des Lautes, den eine feuchte, weiche Masse hören lässt wenn man in derselben geht oder hantiert; den Saft ausdrücken; viel reden, schwatzen': quutschen 'vom Wasser in den Schuhen, von weichem, lehmigem Boden.'

Hess. quitschern 'zwitschern': quatschern 'den Laut bezeichnend, den mit Feuchtigkeit durchdrungene Gegenstände hören lassen, wenn sie mit härtern, trockenen in Berührung kommen (wenn man im Sumpfe watet, etc.)': quutschern 'sich hineinschmiegen (ins Bett).'

Thur. quitschen 'die Tür oft u. geräuschvoll öffnen u. schliessen': quatschen' (man quatscht im Kot, Wasser in den Stiefeln quatscht); die Tür heftig zuwerfen,' quatscheln 'eine Flüssigkeit schütteln, zappeln': quutschen 'schlüpfen, rasch fliessen; in tiefem Tone quatschen.' Cf. No. 243.

233. N. kvidra 'go back and forth with short quick movements; bob; play; swarm with small creeping things': kvadrast (impersonal) 'go on with difficulty and slowly.'

E. dial. quiddle 'fuss about trifles, fiddle about, fret': dial.

quaddle 'waddle': dial. quoddle 'make noises while boiling, dry, make limp or flabby.' Cf. No. 243a.

234. Hess. quallen 'schluchzend, übertrieben weinen': quallern 'mit Geräusch hervorsprudeln; in den Gedärmen rumpeln.'

235. Wald. kwiren 'schreien (von jungen Vögeln), girren': kwaren 'schreien (von Kindern und Fröschen).'

Pr. quirren 'quarren in hoher Tonlage, namentlich von Kindern; klagen, wimmern; blähend im Leibe gurren': quarren 'quacken wie ein Frosch; aus Unzufriedenheit weinen, weinerlich murren, brummen.'

236. WVl. kwikkelen 'shake, wriggle': kwakkelen 'slowly throw up large bubbles (of something cooking in a large vessel).'

Westf.  $kw\bar{\imath}ken(st.)$  'quieken(von Schwein, Stute, Esel), schreien (vom Vogel)': kwacken '(vom Schall eines fallenden weichen Körpers).'

Pr. quiken 'in hohen Tönen hell schreien; zur Bezeichnung des Tones, den Schweine hören lassen, namentlich beim Schlachten': quacken 'mit schwacher, schriller Stimme reden': quackeln 'Unnützes schwatzen, endlos reden.'

Thur. quieken 'vom Ton der Schweine': 'quäkeln 'kleinlich tadeln u. klagen': quaken 'vom Rufen der Frösche.'

Stieg. quīken 'quieken, schreien (mit sehr feiner Stimme)': kwāk'n 'quāken, schreien (mit heller Stimme)': kwāk'n 'mit tiefer breiter Stimme schreien.'

NHD. quieken: quacken.

237. N. hafsa 'work carelessly, hurry ahead hastily and carelessly': hufsa 'push, shake, make heavy, jumping motions.'

F. hippe 'hop, skip, frisk, bounce.'

Groningen hippen 'the jumping of small insects': happig, haps adj. 'eager for something': huppen 'the jumping run of birds, also of insects.'

Dutch happen 'snatch, snap at': huppen, huppelen 'hop, skip, frisk, bounce.'

Wald. hapelen 'hastig sein,' hapelech 'hastig,' hapech 'gierig': hupelen 'hinken, schwerfällig gehen, wanken, wackeln,' hupelech 'holprig, uneben.'

Lux. hippen 'lahm sein; auf einem Beine gehen': happen 'auf Haufen bringen': huppen 'hüpfen, niederkauern.'

Hess. hippeln 'hinken, zappelnd laufen (scherzhaftes Wort)': happen 'begierig sein, nach etwas schnappen,' happeln 'übereilt handeln.'

237a. Westf. habbeln 'schnell u. unordentlich sprechen': hubbeln 'hinken.'

Els. hippe 'auf der Weidenpfeife blasen, tuten; gierig trinken,' hüpple 'hüpfend auf einem Beine gehen,' hüppere 'springen, schnell davonlaufen; hinken': happle 'täppeln, unsicher u. ungeschickt gehen; herumstolpern': hapere (unpersönlich) 'stocken, langsam u. schwer vorwärts kommen': hopple 'hüpfen, besonders auf einem Bein; hinken; ruckweise springen; wackeln; schlecht tanzen, anstossen,' hoppere 'stossweise gehen, springen (Wagen auf gefrorenem Wege; Frösche), hinken', hopperle 'mit kleinen Schritten springen, hüpfen, im Gehen schwanken.'

238. D. dial. hime 'breathe pressedly and noisily': humre 'show satisfaction with a low and, as it were, grunting sound (of horses); scold; laugh low.'

OF. himen 'pfeifend atmen, keuchen': hummel 'Hummel.' Westf. hummeln 'grummeln, donnern,' hummelte f. 'Hummel': haime f. 'Hausgrille; Elbe.'

239. J. hample 'stammer, stutter': humple 'walk awkwardly and carelessly.'

OF. hampeln 'greifend hin u. her fahren, strampeln': humpeln 'gebrechlich gehen, hinken': himphampen 'hinken, humpeln.'

240. Hess. hadern 'sich streiten': hudern 'wiehern, wiehernd atmen'.

Stieg. hedern, hadern 'sich zanken, hadern, streiten': hudern 'etwas oberflächlich machen, besorgen; frösteln, schaudern, sich im Staube baden (von Hühnern).'

Schw. hadere 'unruhig herumlaufen, sich übereilen': huderen 'wirr werden, zerfallen': hauderen 'etwas mit überstürzter Eile tun.'

241. N. hikka 'step unsurely and jerkily, as on a sick foot, talk stammeringly and with repetitions,' hikra 'laugh much, whinny with laughter; make repeated small, short movements; give small portions,' hiksta 'hiccough, sob': hakka 'hack, hew,

dig; chop to pieces; chatter with the teeth,' hakla 'crack, bang, give a crackling sound': hokra 'limp, walk with difficulty and bobbingly, as with weak feet': hukra 'bend together, especially with cold; give a low trembling sound,' hukla 'shake, tremble, jolt; tremble or bend up from cold.'

S. hicka 'hiccough': hacka 'hoe, hack.'

D. hikke 'hiccough': hakke 'hack, hoe, grub, peck, chop, mince; stutter.'

E. hack : dial. hick 'sob, hiccough.'

OF. hikken 'mit einem scharfen oder spitzen Etwas auf ein anderes Etwas stossen u. schlagen': hakken 'hacken, hauen.'

Westf. hicken 'im Sprichwort bai well helpen hicken maut ock helpen picken,' hickeln 'wackeln (von der Messerklinge)': hacken 'hacken': hickhack 'Hacke.'

Lux. hicken 'schluchzen,' hickeren 'den Schluchzer haben': hackelen 'stottern': huckelen 'gewohnheitsmässig hocken; greinen,' hucken 'hocken.'

Hess. hickeln 'hinken, leicht hinken': huckeln 'auf dem Rücken tragen,' huckern 'einhüllen u. wärmen.'

Els. hickere 'bergauf klimmen, krumm gehen, mit einem steifen Bein hinken; lachen': hacke' den Boden umbracken; schlecht sprechen': hocke, hucke 'sitzen, sich setzen.'

Bav. hecken 'stechen': hacken 'hacken': hocken, hucken 'hocken.'

241a. N. higra 'tremble with cold, especially of the sound uttered; laugh mockingly, giggle': hugra 'shake, move backward and forward (of a vehicle on an uneven road); shake and bend from cold, mostly with a shuddering noise; storm ahead noisely and destructively.'

Note.—hw-, hv-, wh- see under w-, following.

242. D. hvippe 'pipe (of small birds)': hvuppe, vuppe 'bark (of young dogs).'

E. weep: whoop.

OF. wippen, wüppen 'schwingen u. schnellen; hüpfen, tanzen': wepeln, wäpeln 'schwingen, schaukeln': wappen 'auf u. nieder, hin u. her bewegen oder schlagen; schwingen, schwanken, schaukeln': wup-di 'rascher Schwung; Trunk Branntwein.'

242a. OF. wibbeln, wübbeln 'sich oder etwas rasch, hurtig u. leicht hin u. her bewegen ': wabbeln 'sich hin u. her bewegen (namentlich von losem, lockern Zeug)': wubbeln, wübbeln 'i. q. wibbeln u. wabbeln.'

Westf. wibbeln 'wimmeln': wabbeln, wabbern 'sich hervordrängen (von Fleisch oder Fett)': wubbeln 'waschend über den Körper hin u. her fahren.'

Wald. wiwelen 'wimmeln' : wawelen 'weich sein, von Fett schlottern.'

 ${\bf Pr.}\ wibbeln$  'wimmeln' : wabbeln 'schlottern, wie es weiche oder fette Körper tun.'

Lux. wibbelen 'sich bewegen, wimmeln' : wabbelen 'herunterhängen.'

Hess. wibbeln 'wimmeln': wābern, wabeln 'sich schnell aber wankend hin u. her bewegen.'

Bav. wibeln, wibbeln 'sich regen, schnell bewegen, wimmeln': wabeln 'schwatzen; sich hin u. her bewegen,' wabern, 'sich hin u. her bewegen': wubeln 'wimmeln.' Cf. No. 231.

242b. E. dial. wimble 'enter or move in a sinuous manner; twist round and round': dial. wamble 'rumble, roll, stir uneasily (of the intestines), move unsteadily to and fro, quiver, shake.'

243. Thur. witschen 'entwischen, huschen, schlüpfen': watscheln 'wackligen Gang haben.'

Bav. witschen 'sich rasch, eilig bewegen, huschen': watscheln 'schwerfällig, schleppend u. wackelnd gehen': wutschen = witschen, wutscheln = watscheln. Cf. No. 232a.

243a. E. dial. widdle 'walk slowly about, waddle, wriggle, work slowly, oscillate, struggle, deceive, fret': waddle 'take short steps and move from side to side in walking,' dial. 'wrap up clumsily, swaddle; drag a river; bargain': dial. wuddle 'hold in an awkward, tumbled manner.' Cf. No. 233.

244. E. dial. wizzle 'move stealthily, creep, run out slowly (of liquids); wheedle': dial. wozzle, wuzzle 'beat or trample down.'

244a. E. whistle: dial. whustle 'rustle.'

244b. Hess. wispeln 'sich eilig hin u. her bewegen ': wuspeln 'durch herumgehen in der Nacht Geräusch erregen.'

Els. wispele 'mit den Fingern herumtasten; in fortwährender

Unruhe sein; flüstern': wasple 'mit den Händen hastig hin u. her fahren': wuspele = wispele.

245. Dutch wisschen 'wipe, clean, whisk, rub, sponge': wasschen 'wash; paint in water-colors.'

NHD. wischen: waschen.

Els. wische 'wischen; leicht u. schnell mit oder an etwas hin u. her fahren, besonders mit der Hand': wesche 'wehen, hin u. her bewegen, mit Handen u. Füssen zappeln': wasche 'waschen, heftig regnen; schlagen; schwatzen; aufsehen erregen durch hochmütiges Benehmen.'

Bav. wischen 'wischen, leicht u. schnell an etwas hin u. her fahren; mit der Rute streichen': waschen 'waschen, schleppend oder in weiten Kleidern dahergehen; schelten; prügeln.'

246. E. warble 'schmettern, trillend singen,' dial. 'play the quicker measures of a piece of bagpipe music; swing, reel': dial. wurble 'move in a slow sinuous manner, wriggle, crawl.'

247. E. wiggle 'wriggle,' dial. 'reel, stagger': wag 'shake to and fro,' waggle 'wag,' dial. 'waddle, stagger along unsteadily.'

Dutch wiegelen 'jolt, totter, shake': waggelen 'stagger, waddle, totter.'

Pr. wiggeln 'wackelnd hin u. her wiegen' : waggeln 'wackeln; prügeln.'

248. OF. winken (st. u. sw.) 'winken, nicken, sich neigen, abnehmen': wenken 'winken, nicken, schläfrig werden': wanken, 'wanken, sich hin u. her bewegen.'

Pr. winken (sw. doch fehlerhaft auch st.) 'ein Zeichen gehen, mit Hand oder Auge; sich die Augen zuhalten': wanken 'schwanken; herumwandeln': wunk m. 'scherzhafte Umbildung von wink in einem einen Wunk mit dem Zaunpfahl gehen.'

NHD. winken: wanken.

249. E. dial. whinge 'whine, cry, whimper': whang 'beat, thrash, bang,' dial. 'eat voraciously, chop, wrench.'

LEONARD BLOOMFIELD

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

## THE AUTHORSHIP AND DATE OF THE FAYRE $MAIDE\ OF\ THE\ EXCHANGE$

Since the anonymous publication of the Fayre Maide of the Exchange which was entered on the Stationer's Registers, April 24, 1607 (Arber Reprint, III, 347), and reprinted in 1625, 1634, and 1637. the open question of its authorship had been variously decided. First ascribed to Thomas Heywood in Kirkman's catalogue of 1671, it was stoutly championed by Charles Lamb (Specimens of English Dramatic Poets, II, 186) in 1826, and accepted without question by some twenty-one others, among them Barron Field and John Pearson, who edited the play in 1846 and 1874 respectively. On the other hand, Gerard Langbaine (English Dramatic Poets, 1687, p. 263) questioned Kirkman's ascription and was followed in his doubts by a writer in the Retrospective Review, 1825, IX, 126; by Mr. Fleay (Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama, 1891, II, 329); by Mr. Ward (History of English Dramatic Literature, 1899, II, 572); by Mr. Greg (A List of Masques and Pageants, 1902, p. lxvii), who simply said, however, that Kirkman's ascription was without authority, and by Professor Schelling (Elizabethan Drama, 1908, I, 349, 501). Undoubtedly the agreement of these critics is the strongest argument against Heywood's authorship; yet an analytic comparison of the play with his known work would seem to show that their conclusions are based on over-hasty personal impression and with no due allowance for certain unfortunate facts in the conditions and manner of Heywood's work as an author. Mr. Greg's opinion may

References to the play will be indicated by F. M. of Ex.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Winstanley, Lives of the Most Famous English Poets, 1687, p. 90; Whincop, "List of Dramatic Authors and Pieces," affixed to Scanderbeg, 1747, p. 117; Chetwood, British Theatre, 1750; Cibber, Lives of Poets of Great Britain, 1753, I. 271; Baker, Companion to the Playhouse, 1764, II (Vol. I gives F. M. of Ex. as anonymous); Reed and Jones, Biographica Dramatica, 1812, I. 332; Edinburgh Review, April, 1841, p. 221; Halliwell, Dictionary of Old Plays, 1860, p. 90; Prölss, Geachichte des neuren Dramas, 1882, II, 178; Dictionary of National Biography, 1885; Griffith, Evenings with Shakespear, 1889, p. 214; Symonds, Mermaid Heywood, p. xv; Hazlitt, Manual for the Collector of Old Plays, 1892; Saintsbury, Elizabethan Literature, 1899, II, 283; Eckhardt, Die lustige Person im älteren englischen Drama, 1902, Index; Bang, ed., Pleasant Dialogues and Dramas, 1903, p. 361; Garnett and Gosse, Hist. English Literature, 1904, II, 341; Adams, Dictionary of Drama, 1904, I, 479; Seccombe, Hist. English Literature, 1906, I, 118.

be dismissed with the admission of the meagerness of the external evidence, which is the ground of his objection, since it is only internal evidence in this case which offers any safe guidance. We may also reject Mr. Ward's criticism which wavers between acceptance of Mr. Fleay's theory and "respect for the safe instinct of Charles Lamb."

Mr. Fleav's first argument is the occurrence in the Prologue of the line "shore up our tender pamping twig," which he believed would indicate a young author and not one of Heywood's mature standing. Aside from the fact that such an inference regarding his youth and natural lack of fame would be literally true,1 the metaphorical modesty of the line is not only usual but characteristic of Heywood's references to his own work. The Prologue to his greatest play, A Woman Killed with Kindness, contains an avowal in which identically the same humble imagery is used. In the dedication of his Troia Britannica (1609), Heywood speaks of his muse trying her "weak unable wing." The Marriage Triumph (1613) laments the "weakness of his skille;" the address to his fellow city actors in the Apology for Actors begs excuse for his "ignorance" and for the "infancy" of his judgment. In the dedication of The Fair Maid of the West (1631), he speaks of it as a "weak and unpollish't Poem," and again in the dedication (1633) of The English Traveller, he mourns that "weakness and bashfulnesse" discourage him.

Much of this is conventional, but it proves, nevertheless, that Heywood kept to a consistent depreciation of his own works. "The keynote of his character seems to have been an unaffected modesty" (Dict. National Biography) which expressed itself sometimes in the stiff artificial ways just given and sometimes in genuine simplicity. To lovers of Heywood the quaintly generous line of the Apology for Actors, in which he described himself as the youngest and weakest of the brood of his great contemporaries, is the final expression of his real humility. There is no reason, therefore, from either his practice or character, to infer that he would not have written the line which Mr. Fleay disputed. On the contrary it is a considerable argument in favor of Heywood's authorship, so thoroughly does it agree with other known words of his.

The fact that the  $F.\ M.\ of\ Ex.$  is filled with Shaksperean allusions,

<sup>1</sup> See p. 14.

constitutes Mr. Fleay's next argument. This seems a strange argument for a Shaksperean scholar to advance, since the literary influence of the great dramatist on the minor one was so natural and so obvious. Space does not permit of more than a few notable illustrations of a hardly disputed point. In The Four Prentices, II, 216,1 there is plain imitation of the Portia-Nerissa scene in The Merchant of Venice; The Brazen Age closely follows Venus and Adonis; the whole play of The Rape of Lucrece is full of hints of Shakspere's famous poem; there are Shaksperean echoes in King Edward IV and in The Royal King and Loyal Subject (ed. K. Tibballs, 1906, notes). A considerable likeness between an incident in Cymbeline and one in A Challenge for Beauty was long ago pointed out by Mr. Dilke (Old Plays, VI, 325), and more recently by Mr. Ward (English Dramatic Literature, II, 371), who also suggested a further likeness between The Challenge and The Merchant of Venice. Professor Schelling (Elizabethan Drama, I, 352) points out the correspondence between The Captives and Pericles. The allusions to Shakspere's earlier plays in the F. M. of Ex. cannot be urged, consequently, as any positive argument against Heywood's authorship.

Mr. Fleay's third argument, the plea for Machin's authorship, is based on a similarity of quotation, from Shakspere's Venus and Adonis, in the F. M. of Ex. and The Dumb Knight, and is the weakest of any which he advanced. Nothing is known of Machin except that he shared "in the wrong" as he called it, of writing The Dumb Knight; his partner was Gervase Markham. Professor Schelling says of this play (Elizabethan Drama, I, 204), "It contains, besides its heroical main plot, a coarse underplot in Middletonian vein, places luscious bits of Venus and Adonis in the mouth of one of the most scurrilous characters in our old drama, and borrows shamelessly its best scene from Heywood's A Woman Killed." As A Woman Killed was finished, paid for, and being acted in 1602, according to the accounts in Henslow's diary (ed. Greg, 1904, I, 189) the borrowing of the card-playing scene in The Dumb Knight<sup>2</sup> establishes the fact

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>References by volume and page are to Pearson's six-volume edition of Heywood, 1874; by act, scene, and page to the "Mermald Series," ed. Verity. All references to the F. M. of Ex. are to Field's edition, 1846, printed with Fortune by Land and Sea for the Shakespeare Society.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Dumb Knight, ed. Dodsley, X, 187. The verses quoted (ibid., p. 158) from Venus and Adonis are from Il. 229, 234, 13, 17, 18.

that the latter was written after 1602, and probably much later. It was not published until 1608, a year after the publication of A Woman Killed and the F. M. of Ex. Since every fact of internal evidence shows the latter to have been written before 1603, the conclusion is necessary that Machin borrowed from it as freely as he had from A Woman Killed. But, even were it not possible to establish this borrowing, Mr. Fleay's contention would be wholly unconvincing, since it is an obviously impossible business to prove that because two plays had the same quotation from an immensely popular poem, they were by the same man. Aside from the so-called identity of quotation there is nothing in the structure of The Dumb Knight, in its coarse indecency or in its phrasing, which suggests the merry humor and wholesome, pleasantly bourgeois atmosphere of the F. M. of Ex.

The last general argument of Mr. Fleav returned to those doubts of style and character which the earlier critics expressed. However weak his specific arguments appear on examination, his positive "I am sure it is not Heywood's" must be taken seriously, especially as the most recent dictum, that by Professor Schelling (Elizabethan Drama, I, 502) is similar. In the effort to answer this, a close comparative study of Heywood's known work has been made by the writer, and the likenesses classified in distinct groups. In natural consequence of the number and quality of Heywood's dramas, which "attempted nearly every species" (Ward, English Dramatic Literature II, 554) and of his unimaginative vocabulary, many of these similarities are of the incidental and purely conventional sort. There remains, however, a fairly respectable surplus of Heywood's characteristic handiwork which represents for the most part his least inspired production and, therefore, that least likely to be imitated by anyone save himself.

#### SCENE

The scene of the F. M. of Ex. is that beloved London of which Heywood possessed such ample knowledge. The references to it are not many but they are in the words of one sure of his local color.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Venus and Adonis, ed. Rolfe, note p. 170. Cf. Ingleby, Shakespeare's Centurie of Prayse, pp. 23, 30, 44, 107. "Collier was the first to point out the quotation in the F. M. of Ez. as an early proof of the popularity of Shakespere's poem." H. Anderson, Shakespeare Society Papers, 1847, III, 55.

Mile-end (I, i, 37);<sup>1</sup> the Exchange, with its "beautous gallant walk" (III, i, 47),<sup>2</sup> its tiers of shops about the square, its young foppish gallants, its fair sempsters, its pattern drawer; the Counters (II, ii, 8), with their famous wards;<sup>2</sup> St. Paul's Churchyard (III, ii, 106), of the "rolls and bundles of cast wit" where the stationers kept up their busy trade;<sup>4</sup> Gracious Street (Gracechurch) (II, ii, 87),<sup>5</sup> are places necessarily familiar to any reader of Heywood's plays. London is the scene of four of his plays<sup>5</sup> and in all the professedly English and modern plays, the references to its special locality are frequent. Mile-end is prominent in Edward IV; the second part of If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody concerns itself with the building of the Exchange; and the special streets, shops, and taverns are everywhere mentioned with the same tone of easy knowledge that characterizes them in the F. M. of Ex.

#### CHARACTER

The characters of the play possess strong family resemblances to others of Heywood's creation. Phillis, "the Fair Maid," though she lacks that pathetic quality which so frequently characterized Heywood's women, is neverthless like them in many respects. In her Exchange shop, watching over her fine embroideries and chatting with the 'prentice boy, Phillis suggests Jane Shore showing her husband's wares to the disguised King Edward (I, 64); or pretty Luce working her laced handkerchief in the goldsmith's shop, and greeting Boyster's approach with the conventional "What is't you lack?" (Wise Woman, I, i, 258). Like Lady Mary Audley (Royal King, VI, 25), Phillis recognizes the claims of her lover before those of her father; she manages her own love affairs and seeks her recreant suitor with the courage of a second Luce (Wise Woman); she does her wooing even as the French Lady in the Four Prentices (II, 180), or as Lauretta in the Maydenhead Well Lost (IV, 134);

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Edward IV, I, 16, 22, 24, etc.

<sup>2</sup> Wise Woman, III, ii, 191.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., II, ii, 273; Royal King, VI, 39; Edward IV, I, 19.

<sup>\*\*</sup> Edward IV, 1, 26; If You Know, I, 269; Royal King, VI, 8; Fair Maid of the West, II, 317.

<sup>5</sup> Wise Woman, I, 1, 256. II, 1, 315.

<sup>6</sup> Edward IV; If You Know; Four Prentices; Royal King.

Rape of Lucrece, III, v, 383. Cf. reference to the Star, F. M. of Ex., II, i, 30.

and she wavers in her affections with the unaccountable vacillation of Mistress Frankford in A Woman Killed. The inability to motive properly such changes, and a lack of realism, may be said to distinguish Heywood's "lady" heroines. Like Phillis, they are possessed of an impossibly bright beauty always conventionally described, and have usually her somewhat self-conscious air of propriety.

But it is the men of the play who possess, as Heywood's men commonly do, much more distinctive features. In Master Flower, easy-going and somewhat slow of wit, there is special likeness to those old, kindly, and much-abused fathers, whom Heywood loved from the time when he first read Plautus. Flower has a little mannerism of speech, "a good conceit," that matches the "my further honor still" of Aldana, father of the imperious Petroncella in the Challenge for Beauty, the "bones a me" of Hobson in If You Know. Flower dotes on his lovely wilful daughter, indulging and never seeing through her small wiles, with a tenderness very suggestive of Luce's father, of Aldana, of Martiall in the Challenge for Beauty, of old Forrest in Fortune by Land and Sea, who most surely was Heywood's creation. The whole character of loveableness and simplicity is Flower's, dashed with a bit of that choleric temper which Heywood, at his best, could do so well.

Of the other male characters, Frank's two brothers are but fainter replicas of himself and the three are typical of the ordinary seventeenth century lover, over-passionate and extravagantly expressive of his own emotions. Frank jeers at the sonnet-writing lovers and falls to it himself, like Valladura in the Challenge for Beauty (V, 13). Like the wild-headed young Chartley in The Wise Woman (I, i, 257), he would have nothing to do with marriage. The three brothers, and those flirtatious gallants, Gardiner and Bennet, and the soldiers of fortune, Bobbington and Scarlet, are too obviously types and too lightly sketched for any argument to be taken from them. The

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>The term "lady" is employed to distinguish these heroines from Heywood's women of low class, who are portrayed with masculine realism and are possessed of masculine vigor.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> "In Edward IV, Heywood already resorts to the familiar stage trick of attaching a telling catchword to a humorous character" (Ward, II, 558). See the "and so forth" of Josselin, the "do what ye will, for me" of Mistress Blague in Edward IV.

 $<sup>^3\</sup>mathrm{Cf}.$  Sir Harry's testiness, Wise Woman, II, ii, 275, and the old fathers in English Traveller.

Cripple, "that excellent fellow," as Lamb calls him, whose deformity is an essential feature of the action, has naturally no counterpart among Heywood's characters, except as they duplicate his virtues. His first appearance as a heroic rescuer of distressed damsels, his fight against heavy odds, brings to mind, of course, the similar scenes in the Four Prentices. Bowlder, the humorous gallant, with his affectations, his good heart, and his blunt unluckiness of speech. bears a distinct resemblance to Boyster, the blunt lover of Luce in The Wise Woman. Master Berry, by his miserly habits and opinions, by the denunciations hurled at him and the glee with which he is cheated by Fiddle, plays the Shylock rôle of the usurer, only less common in Heywood's plays than that of the old father.1 The character of Fiddle, the clown, is, however, the best drawn and most representative in the F. M. of Ex. Fiddle is own brother to those other clowns whom Ward says (English Dramatic Literature, II, 586) "Heywood made to order." Fiddle, whose wit is of the same quality, has the elements of their humor: the impudent giveand-take style of conversation, the absurd assumptions of dignity. his Lakienstolz, for instance,2 the word quibblings and merry lies,3 the reckless jokes to or about their mistresses, which give vivacity to their comedy. He knows the same merry ways of begging and extortion, the same effective pretenses which Heywood's clowns usually practiced.

#### PLOT

The plot of the F. M. of Ex. suggests several of Heywood's plays in its general structure and in certain incidents. The two main plots are handled with that curious independence which Ward (English Dramatic Literature, II, 589, 570) points out as characteristic of Heywood. They are connected externally by the friendship of the two old fathers, Flower and Berry, in much the same way that the friendship of Old Wincott and Old Lionel brings together the two plots of The English Traveller. The main plot concerning Phillis

of Cf. Shafton, Woman Killed, III, i, 29; and Usurer, English Traveller, III, ii, 203.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Fair Maid of the West, II, 308, 329, etc.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Maydenhead Well Lost, IV, 132.

<sup>4</sup>Cf. Wise Woman, II, il. 271. For further study of Heywood's clowns see Eckhardt. Die lustige Person im älteren englischen Drama, Index, 1902.

resembles others of Heywood's in the disguises1 which play so important a part in its development; in the speediness of that love at first sight which vanquishes the unwilling hero,2 and in the unexplained variability of her affections. The assault in the first scene recalls that in The Fair Maid of the West (II, 389), and the two in The Four Prentices of London (II, 189, 226). The gallant controversy of Anthony and Ferdinand is paralleled in the dispute of the "foure Bretheren" over Bella Franca (II, 209), and the suspicious hiding and spying on each other of the two brothers in the F. M. of Ex. also strongly suggests The Four Prentices; the tragi-comic scene in which the always despised usurer, the loan of a hundred pounds, the bond broken by a dissolute young debtor, and a sympathetic friend, are familiar elements, suggests like scenes in A Woman Killed and The English Traveller. The begging scene between Berry and Fiddle in II, 2, 162, is very like that between Sir Harry and Taber in The Wise Woman of Hogsdon (II, ii, 271); in each case the servant, pretending knowledge of a somewhat scandalous secret, pockets a bribe and then confesses the peculiarly inoffensive truth. In Frank's accosting of Fiddle "perambulating before" his mistress (III, ii, 150), there is likeness to the meeting of Gratiana and Taber, in The Wise Woman (III, ii, 287).

### LIKENESS IN EXPRESSION

Verbal comparison of the F. M. of Ex. with Heywood's plays is at once an enlightening and a disappointing task. The likeness of vocabulary is evident at the first glance, and further search reveals that every word, almost every simile and metaphor of the play, however uncommon or oddly used, is elsewhere used by Heywood in the same sense. But it is necessary to acknowledge that Heywood's vocabulary was not distinctive. His first thought was for action, not for fine discrimination of phrase and word, and his work does not, therefore, present many strikingly individual features for comparison. However, among the same somewhat unusual words which he elsewhere uses, may be noted the following: cothurnicke

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Cf. Wise Woman; Fair Maid of the West, II, 103; Golden Age, III, 29; Challenge, V, 63; Edward IV, I, 41, 64; Four Prentices, II, 287.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Cf. Edward IV, I, 60; Woman Killed, III, i, 31; Fair Maid of the West, V, i, 140; Wise Woman, III, ii, 287.

Prologue (Apology for Actors, p. 33); bombaste, to stuff, II, ii, 12, (Prologue, English Traveller); tracers, dancers, II, i, 37, (Woman Killed, I, ii, 9, to trace); perplexion, II, ii, 259, (Golden Age, III, 1); contentious, III, i, 15, (Royal King, VI, 41); submisse, V, i, 154, (King Edward IV, I, 128); bandied, V, i, 374, (Fortune by Land and Sea, ed. Field, IV, v, 16). Such proverbial and conventional phrases as "there the game doth go," I, ii, 12; "break your day," II, ii, 130; "upon the tenters," II, iii, 39; "what lack ye," III, i, 58, are repeated respectively in King Edward IV, I, 143; The English Traveller, III, ii, 203; A Challenge for Beauty, V, 11; and The Wise Woman of Hogsdon, I, ii, 258. Parallels to such figures of speech as a winged Muse, Prologue; a fiery heart, I, iii, 193; a sea of pleasure, I. iii. 68: a beautiful woman a comet, IV, ii, 26; Cupid a wag, IV, ii, 94, may be found in Troia Britannica, A Woman Killed, V, iii, 66, Wise Woman of Hogsdon, IV, ii, 300, A Maydenhead Well Lost, IV, 109, and Love's Mistress, V, 139. Perhaps the most especially significant phrase in the play is that descriptive of an overloquacious person as a "parenthesis of words," III, i, 93, or a "parenthesis of jests," IV, ii, 257, which is repeated in King Edward IV, I, 29. Foreign allusions, to Spain, to India, to Barbary, are of just that off-hand, more or less conventional kind Heywood usually introduced into his plays. The apt familiarity of his local references has already been noted. The classical allusions are to those familiar characters in myth or history, in whom his other works show special interest. Jove's adventures referred to in Act II, iii, 190, are the subject-matter of The Golden Age; Venus and Adonis, I, iii, 228. and III, iii, 67, act their traditional parts in The Brazen Age, III, 184; the adventures of Hercules, III, iii, 48, are dramatized in The Silver Age and The Brazen Age; Helen, III, ii, 88, is the heroine of The Iron Age; Phillis and her lover, Demophoon, III, ii, 170, are bewailed in The General History of Women (1657), p. 407; Nestor is mentioned in The Brazen Age and The English Traveller. Here as elsewhere Heywood's knowledge of Ovid is plain; in fact the Metamorphoses might well be called his book in the same sense that it was Chaucer's. In The General History of Women, pp. 67-76, Heywood gives an "Abstract of all the fables in the fifteen Books of Ovid's Metamorphoses;" in the Apology for Actors he quoted and translated at some length from the *Heroidum Epistulae*. It was very probably Heywood who wrote in *The Witches of Lancashire*, IV, 190, with a raillery like Shakspere's in his later years, "this gentleman speakes like a Country Parson that took his text out of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*."

## RHYME AND METER

The apology which Mr. Collier wrote for the verse of The Fair Maid of the West (Shakespeare Society, 1850, p. x) belongs with even more propriety to the F. M. of Ex. There is much confusion in the division of the lines, the verse is frequently awkward and careless, and shows especially the lack of any author's revision. But even so, there are some striking metrical analogies with Heywood's work. Of the 2,538 lines in the F. M. of Ex., 18 per cent. are rhymed; 17 per cent. of the 1,966 lines in A Woman Killed, 14 per cent. of the 2,462 lines in The Rape of Lucrece, are likewise rhymed. These percentages are the best answer to Professor Schelling's argument that "the attempts at poetry where poetry is out of place are peculiarly unlike Heywood's unaffected genius." Rhyme was a distinguishing feature of his early work, as Heywood himself confessed with amused reminiscence in 1637 (Royal King, VI, 84). As to whether it was appropriate or not, that seems an impossible thing for any individual critic rightly to determine. Heywood was very irregular in his use and non-use of rhyme at the end of speeches and scenes, as in his changes from blank verse into heroic couplet; but not more so in the F. M. of Ex. than in any of his acknowledged plays.

## CONCLUSION

From the likenesses of scene, characters, and plot, from the verbal and metrical analogies of the F. M. of Ex. with other plays of Heywood, it is scarcely possible to doubt that this was one of those over-numerous two hundred and twenty plays in which he confessed he had a hand or certainly a very sturdy "main finger" (English Traveller, "To the Reader"). If so much is granted, it is easy to find the reason of its anonymous publication in Heywood's often-voiced lament, that unknown to him and without any of his direction, his plays "kept coming—corrupt and mangled to the

<sup>1&</sup>quot; Address to the Reader," Rape of Lucrece; cf. Golden Age, Four Prentices.

printer's hand." The obvious lack of revision shown, not only in the versification but in the unfinished state of the final incident of the play, the omission of Heywood's special literary trademark, that "aut prodesse solent aut delectare" which occurs so persistently on his titlepages, the omission, too, of that "title for acknowledgment or the formality of an Epistle for ornament," which it was so regularly his custom to write—all these would go far toward indicating a pirated edition. Since Heywood himself so often made it a matter of "formal remonstrance," we may in this case trust Mr. Collier's remark that "no other author of the time had more reason to complain of the pirating and surreptitious printing of his works" (Fair Maid of the West, Shakespeare Society, 1850, p. xi).

Finally, the date when the play was written fits in admirably with what we know of Heywood at that time. That it was written after 1601 is plainly shown, as Mr. Fleay pointed out, by the reference to the death of Thomas Nash, the sharp-witted, bitter-tongued writer, "who gave up his ghost to Luciae's bosom" in 1601, an allusion which Nash's own history and contemporary references to him leave no chance of mistaking. Further internal evidence also shows that the play must have been written before 1603. Rich in allusions to Shakspere's work before that time and even directly imitating it here and there, the F. M. of Ex. shows its author to have been so ignorant of, or so suddenly and strangely indifferent to, the great dramatist's work after 1602, that it practically eliminates all possibility of composition later than that date. In the second place,

<sup>1</sup> Starred passages indicate imitation:

	3), Stanzas 3 and 39. Quoted in FIII, iii, 67*
Love's Labour Lost (S. R., 1607),	III, i, 185-215 F. M. of Ez I, iii, 236*
	V, ii, 269
	IV, i, 85
	V, ii, 272III, ii, 262
	IV, iii, 10III, ii, 283
	V, ii, 524V, i, 226
	IV, iii, 210
Romeo and Juliet (Qs. 1597, 9),	III, v, 153
	II, ii, 1
	III, ii, 6II, i, 3
Merchant of Venice (S. R., 1598),	II, vi, 47II, i, 3*
	V, i, 193-202
	III, ii, 239IV, ii, 128*
Much Ado (S. R., 1600),	II, i, 260III, iii, 42
Twelfth Night (Wr., 1600-2),	I, iii, 60
	393

despite the vigorous comedy of certain scenes and the "April morning freshness" of that perfect lyric, "Ye little birds that sit and sing," the manifest weakness of the play in several structural features, its abundance of rhyme and the occasional immaturity of style, suggest early work. Though possessed of that precocity which so blessed the younger Elizabethans, Heywood was, nevertheless, in 1601–2, simply a hardworking young man of twenty-seven or less, forced, like most of his contemporaries in the intervals of acting, to over-hurried production. If he were, as is probable, already engaged in writing A Woman Killed, the flagging interest so evident in the last part of the F. M. of Ex. is explained.

Mt. Holyoke College

Laura A. Hibbard

1 Dictionary of National Biography.

# "DUKE FREDERICK OF NORMANDY," AN ARTHURIAN ROMANCE

T

The student of literary conditions in western Europe already knows that Norway and her dependency, Iceland, manifested a lively interest in mediaeval literature. That this interest was not confined to native productions may be seen from the large number of Scandinavian translations of foreign masterpieces that have been transmitted from a comparatively early date. It was during the reign of Haakon Haakonson the Elder, of Norway (1217–63), that many of the popular romances of the day were first brought to the North from southern, chiefly French, sources. Some of these works are known to have been translated at King Haakon's command, for example, "Tristan and Isolde" (translated by Brother Rodbert, in 1226), the "Elis Saga" (by the same Rodbert), the "Iwain," the "Möttuls Saga," and the "Strengleikar" (lais). Most of the others came in during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

While it is true that the whole number of romantic productions that were translated into one or more of the Scandinavian tongues is quite large, it is equally true that the proportion of those works which gained popularity in more than one of the northern countries is rather small, as indicated by the number of versions or redactions of a given work, the length of the period of its currency, and the condition of its surviving manuscripts. To the group of those which may be said to have found more than local favor belong the "Iwain," the "Flores and Blanchflor," the "Partonopeus (Partenopex) de Blois," and the Charlemagne Chronicles.

For each of the works mentioned at least one prototype has survived, with which a later version may be compared whenever historical or linguistic questions arise concerning it. In the case of

<sup>1</sup> Cf. E. Kölbing, Riddara Sögur, Strasburg, 1872.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> For detailed accounts of the Scandinavian versions of different mediaeval romances see C. J. Brandt, Romantiek Digtning fra Middelalderen, Vols. I-III, Kebenhavn, 1869–77, especially Vol. III, pp. 287-349; also Samlingar utgifna af Svenska Fornskriftsällskapet, Vol. I, 1, pp. vli-xxx; Vol. II, 3, pp. lxii-xxx; Vol. III, 1, pp. vli-xxxii.

<sup>3951</sup> 

"Duke Frederick of Normandy" the situation is altogether different, for, with the exception of a single version in Old Swedish (and a Danish transcription of the same), this mediaeval romance seems to have disappeared from the literature of all Europe. Believing, however, that there was a time when this work formed a link in the chain which bound all literary Europe together, the writer here offers some account of its history, a résumé of the more important views that have been held regarding it, and a summary of its contents.

Together with "Iwain" and "Flores and Blanchflor," "Duke Frederick of Normandy" is commonly referred to as one of the "Eufemiavisor," i. e., "ballads" or "songs" of Eufemia, so named after a queen of Norway who is said to have caused the three works to be translated between the years 1300 and 1312. Six manuscripts of "Duke Frederick" have survived, five of which are preserved in the Royal Library of Stockholm and one in the library of Skokloster. They range in date from about 1430 to 1523. The condition in which the work is found indicates that even the oldest manuscript is only a copy of a still older one, but of this no trace has been found.

Instalments of "Duke Frederick" were published in 1822 and 1824.<sup>2</sup> The whole work was printed for the first time in 1853.<sup>3</sup> Barring a few necessary variations from the original, the edition of 1853 represents a faithful copy of the oldest extant manuscript. A free adaptation of the story, intended for juvenile reading, is found in Henrik Schück's Sveriges Medeltidssagor.<sup>4</sup> Schück's collection has been translated into English under the title, Mediaeval Stories.<sup>5</sup>

¹So far as I have been able to ascertain there is no historic Frederick of Normandy. On the other hand, I have found a Herzog Friedrich in a German Spielmannsgedicht of 4,210 lines, entitled "Salman und Morolf." This poem has been traced to a Middle Franconian original from about the year 1200. P. Piper (Deutsche National-Litteratur, Bd. 2, 1, p. 205) says of the poem and the series to which it belongs: "Ihrem ganzen Charakter nach gehört die Dichtung in die Zeiten der Kreuzzüge, und der Herzog Friedrich, welcher (v. 726) Ackers erobert, deutet vielleicht auf Herzog Friedrich von Schwaben, welcher Akka 1190-91 einnahm." An examination of the general contents of the poem reveals the following parallels to "Duke Frederick": (1) the abduction of a princess; (2) a magic ring; (3) a chess-board inlaid with gems; (4) a flight across the sea; (5) a dwarf (Madelger) conducting the hero of the story into a mountain (compare, in the order indicated, "Salman und Morolf" in Deut. Nat.-Lit., Bd. 2, 1, pp. 215, 216, 219, 222, 229, and "Duke Frederick" below, ll. 2271-2432, 801-942, 408-48, 2271-2432, 185-274). Unfortunately, the two works show no parallels in the details of their respective episodes.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> By G. W. Gumaelius, in *Iduna*, Vol. IX, 1822; Vol. X, 1824.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> In Vol. III of Samlingar utgifna af Svenska Fornskriftsällskapet, Stockholm, 1853.

Vol. I, Stockholm, 1893.
 Translated by W. F. Harvey, and published by Sands & Co., London, 1902.

As far as the writer's knowledge goes, these two are the only modern versions of the romance.

According to Gustav Storm,<sup>1</sup> the poem belongs to the Arthurian cycle, and seems to be one of a series of productions, which, on a basis of Arthurian material, were composed independently in northern France during the second half of the twelfth century. It was mentioned as early as 1758,<sup>2</sup> and again in 1785,<sup>3</sup> but its existence was not generally known to European scholars before 1811, when their attention was called to it by Nyerup.<sup>4</sup> Since then attempts have been made from time to time to find some other version of the work, but without success, and hence our knowledge of its history rests almost entirely upon the meager information that can be drawn from the poem itself.

In the closing lines of the poem the Swedish translator (or adapter) says that the work was first "turned" from valsko into German by order of Emperor "Otte," and by this statement he very probably means that it was translated from French into German during the reign of Otto IV, who died in 1218. He then adds that "the book was made into rhyme from the German to the Swedish tongue" at the command of Queen Eufemia. The correctness of the latter statement has been seriously questioned by the Norwegian scholars, who have tried to show that the poem did not come into Swedish directly from the German, but through the medium of Old Norse.

They have based their arguments mainly on the following assumptions: (1) that since two of the Eufemia songs, the "Iwain" and the "Flores and Blanchflor," have been handed down in Old Norse translations, the Swedish versions of these two as well as of the third, "Duke Frederick," all go back to Norse originals that have been lost; (2) that any translations in which Queen Eufemia may have had a share would naturally be in prose, for this is the form of all the extant Norse translations that were made before her time; (3) that a queen of Norway, herself a German countess by birth (she was the daughter of Günther von Arnstein), would hardly feel dis-

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Cf. his "Om Eufemiaviserne" in Nordisk Tidskrift for Filologi og Paedagogik. Ny Raekke, I, København, 1874, pp. 28-43.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> By A. A. von Stiernman, in his Tal om de lärda Wettenskapers Tillstånd i Swearike, Stockholm, 1758.

<sup>3</sup> By E. M. Fant, in his Observationes selectae historiam Svecanam illustrantes, I.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup>Rasmus Nyerup, in *Museum für alldeutsche Litteratur*, Bd. II, 1811, pp. 324-28; cf. also his *Morskabslaesning*, København, 1816, pp. 113, 124.

posed to have a translation made in a language (Swedish) that was foreign to her. These views the Swedish scholars have persistently tried to refute.

The question continued to attract the attention of Scandinavian scholars throughout the nineteenth century, though with little or no prospect of final settlement. Finally (1881), Oskar Klockhoff of Upsala subjected the three Eufemia songs to a series of linguistic tests.<sup>3</sup> In his effort to fix the date at which the poems were translated, he found the foreign elements in them to indicate that all three came into the language some time before 1320; in other words, that the dates given in the translations may be accepted as correct.

As regards their sources, a careful comparison of the French, Norse, and Swedish versions of the "Iwain" and the "Flores and Blanchflor" led Klockhoff to believe that these two entered the Swedish through the Norse. Since no comparison of this kind was possible in the case of "Duke Frederick," the question of its nearest prototype had to be determined by the relative preponderance of Norse or German elements in its vocabulary. Of such elements the two German suffixes -in and -lin, being exclusively characteristic of the language of this work, might be taken to point to a German source for the same. But on the whole its language was found to differ so slightly from that of the other writings of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries that Klockhoff was unable to arrive at any definite conclusions. Additional evidences of a German original for "Duke Frederick" were pointed out by Edward Schröder, as follows: (1) the employment of a German diminutive word as a designation of a ring-an object which is always represented by a native word in the other two Eufemia songs; (2) three instances of German abstract nouns in -heet and more than thirty other German words not found in the other two poems; (3) the word ingesinne, which is very frequently met with in Middle Low German as a convenient word for completing a rhyme, is found in rhyme position

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Ct. Nordisk Tidskrift, 1850, p. 50; also Annaler for Nordisk Oldkyndighed og Historie, 1850, pp. 118-21, 163, 309.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Cf. Samlingar utgifna af Svenska Fornskriftsällskapet, Vol. I, 1, pp. vli–xxx; Vol. II, 2, pp. xvli–xxx; Vol. III, 2, pp. 223–28.

 $<sup>^3\</sup>mathrm{Cf.}$  "Studier öfver Eufemiavisorna" (86 pages), in  $Upsala~Universitets~\mathring{A}reskrift,$  Upsala, 1881.

<sup>4</sup>Cf. Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen (1882), pp. 26-32.

three times in "Duke Frederick," these being the only instances of the word in any production in Old Swedish; (4) the German rhyme-combination -lika: -rika occurs proportionately much more often in this poem than it does in the other poems of the collection. Schröder also points out some parallels between "Duke Frederick" and two German fragments, the one published by Karl Regel, the other by Karl Bartsch.<sup>2</sup>

The investigations of Klockhoff and Schröder seem to establish for "Duke Frederick" some Middle Low German prototype which has been lost; beyond this we can, at present, only conjecture. Some of the motifs in our romance are paralleled in several of the French and German romances, but in the process of arrangement and elaboration they have received the impress of the poet's own genius. The poet has, in other words, molded his material into new forms and thus produced a story with characteristic features of its own.

#### II

"Duke Frederick of Normandy" is a metrical romance of 3,232 lines, written in octosyllabic rhyming couplets. The predominant rhythm is iambic with four stresses to each verse. No attempt has been made by the poet to observe any particular rhyme scheme, and in places the measure is extremely irregular. A paraphrase of its contents is given below. In this paraphrase it has been the writer's aim to preserve the continuity of the story in all its essential features, including all proper names, but omitting details which have no bearing on the general trend of thought.

About the time of King Arthur there lived in Normandy a duke by the name of Frederick. He was a man of ability, wealth, courage, and honor, and of a gentle, cheerful disposition, so that he who would give him deserving praise must say that "one now finds fewer such." But on account of his many virtues he was an offense to a number of the lords, especially to some of his own kinsmen, for at that time true chivalry was on such a low plane that to find the man who would rightly cultivate it was a difficult task indeed. [28–58.]

Now Duke Frederick was a lover of the hunt, and it happened that when he and his knights were once riding along through a grove named

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> See footnote 1, p. 400, below. <sup>2</sup> See footnote 1, p. 405, below. <sup>3</sup> Cf. Introduction to Vol. I of Henrik Schück's Sveriges Medeltidesagor, Stockholm, 1893.

<sup>4</sup> The numbers refer to the lines of the text.

Asiant they heard a great noise, as of a large flock of deer. But when the hounds were sent in pursuit they ran only "the width of a field" and then returned. From this the duke concluded that the place must be haunted and therefore returned with his men to the castle (called Kali-

das). [59-82.]

Clad in a rich military coat, white trousers of the finest workmanship, and a large glistening helmet, the duke rode out alone early the next morning. Over the whole surface of his shield was spread a bow of gold, and the richness of his metal decorations would take long to describe. As he was thus riding along on his blood-red steed, the road was suddenly lost to view; but on looking ahead he saw a wooded mountain in the distance, and he decided, though not without some reluctance and fear, to ride up to it. On approaching the mountain he noticed little foot prints, "all after the likeness of man," then a little horse tied to a tree, and presently also a dwarf. Then Frederick was glad that he had gone out on adventure that day. Soon after, another dwarf rode up to him on a horse that was smaller than a deer but larger than a roebuck. This dwarf had on a red military coat of costly silk, under which was a collar of mail, and his trousers were white as ivory. His helmet was bordered with gold and studded with precious stones, among them a carbuncle in front and a hyacinth behind, and all around were amethysts and rubies, sapphires, turquoises, emeralds, garnets, and many more that would take too long to enumerate. In his hand he held a lance about three ells in length. [83-184.]

After an exchange of greetings with the duke, the dwarf began to relate how he, a king of great wealth and large domains, had been banished and how most of his courtiers had deserted him. Within three days the new king was to occupy his castle (Karlamit) and take full possession of the land. Malnrit, the deposed king of the dwarfs, prayed the duke to help him defend his rightful title and kingdom.\(^1\) This

Compare the following "Bruchstück eines Gedichtes aus dem Kreise der Artussage" (published by Karl Regel in Zeitschrift für deutsches Alterthum, XI, pp. 490 ff.). The fragment (289 lines) contains an account of some of the circumstances connected with a tourney which was given annually at the court of a certain Sirikirsan. A dwarf by the name of Malgrim, apparently despairing of his ability to gain the object of his love through his own efforts, has cunningly arranged to have Segremors appear as his champion (II. 66-77):

do Segremors quam so na, das er in wol erkante, vz dem volke er rante, der helt ellens riche, vå sprach vil vroliche "Ich hoffe vi gedinge, das mir nv gelinge, nv ich vch here bringe." "Herre," sprach Malgrim, "ir sült mir nv güt sin: ob v lycke hie gescicht.

so ne sůlt ir min vůrgezzen nicht."

The remainder of the fragment relates to the reception of Segremors at the court of Sirikirsan.

Frederick promised to do, in so far as he would be able to oppose the enemy alone. With this understanding the two proceeded on in the direction of the castle, the little king leading the way through a narrow mountain pass. As they approach the castle, Frederick is told to stop and wait until Malnrit has informed his men of the former's arrival, for, if they were to see him unexpectedly, they would all run away, because they are all small, just like the king himself. [185–274.]

Presently the king's courtiers come out to greet the duke and conduct him to the castle. Here he is obliged to leave his horse outside, owing to the small size of the main entrance. The dwarfs themselves are so small that in removing the saddle from the duke's horse one of them has to stand on a chair. Frederick is conducted into the mountain and finds its interior gorgeously decorated with costly hangings of silks and satins. Geindor, the dwarf queen, who measures only two spans and a half in height, is decked in gold and precious stones, and wears a belt of such marvelous beauty that a thousand pounds would be but a fair estimate of its value. The palace is of marble and is illumined by red, white, green, and brown lights. Its windows are of alder and the benches and stools, of cypress. The table, at which the men are served with mead, wine, and a great variety of food, is a hundred thousand times more gorgeous than the emerald table of priest John of India, with its ivory legs and its amethyst, whose effectiveness against drunkenness "is known from the stone book."-After feasting at this table in the presence of fair queen Geindor, the duke retires for the night. [275-407.]

When he rises the next morning, Aribant, the dwarf chamberlain, waits on him with two golden wash basins. Having made his toilet, he is invited to inspect a large number of costly robes, and a chess table inlaid with an amount of rare gems that could not be bought with all his possessions in Normandy. [408–48.]

On the third day of the duke's visit with the dwarfs, the enemies of King Malnrit appear and pitch their tents out on a plain beyond the park that surrounds his palace. On the tent of the rebel king an eagle is poised, as if about to fly. With many fires and much noise the enemy now begin to prepare their food, and in the meantime the duke calls together all the dwarfs in the palace, telling them to arm themselves for the impending battle. Once more King Malnrit begs the duke to help him defend his throne, promising in return all the gold and precious stones that he can carry, but the latter prefers to tender his services gratis, [449–506.]

The battle alarm is sounded. With the understanding that he is to rush out at the critical moment, Frederick hides under a mountain ash, and King Malnrit opens battle with all the bravery of a Parcival or a Gawain. With a thrust that hurls both rider and horse to the ground the little king quickly vanquishes the first of the twelve hostile knights

who gallop out against him. Then, drawing his sword, be begins to cut down both friends and kinsmen, but is soon overwhelmed by their superior numbers and is forced to flee to where the duke is keeping himself concealed. Now the latter dashes against the rebels, and, taking them by twos, he tosses them about in every direction. At this point the dwarfs in the palace rush out and capture; fifteen hundred of the enemies, among them all the instigators of the rebellion. These are: Otrik, the rebel king; Yrrik, a nephew of King Malnrit; Yrpon and Malnzir, two dukes. [507-660.]

An investigation to determine the cause of the insurrection fixes the guilt mainly on Yrrik, who is convicted of shameful treason. As a penalty, he is straightway beheaded, together with some dukes, counts, and lords, who had been his accomplices. Otrik is pardoned on condition of

swearing fealty to Malnrit. [661-732.]

In return for his help in checking the rebellion, Frederick is invited by Malnrit to accept the rule of his entire kingdom, but the duke regards the whole affair as an honor to himself and therefore declines this generous offer. Malnrit then begs him to state before the rebel dwarfs that when he was in heaven he heard of their wrong to their king, and that if any one of them should ever as much as speak a word against their ruler, he (Frederick) would send down from heaven twenty men like himself with orders to roast and boil them alive. This announcement results in a plea for mercy and promise of obedience from the dwarfs. [733–800.]

Having induced the duke to return with him to the palace, the little king brings out the aforementioned table and begs him to accept it as a gift. But the latter politely declines and straightway makes ready to leave. When he rides away his little friend accompanies him for some distance, and, on parting, bestows on him a magic ring with four stones: one against injury by sword, another against injury by water, the third against injury by fire; but the fourth, which is from India, far surpasses the other three, for whoever carries it may render himself invisible at will. [801–942.]

After parting with the dwarf king, Frederick continues on his way until he is suddenly arrested by the terrified cries of a woman. On coming nearer he discovers that a giant has tied the woman to a tree and her husband to the belly of a horse, and that he is mercilessly flogging the man. Frederick demands of the giant to state the reason for this horrible cruelty, when the answer comes back in the form of a challenge:

Fool, come here to me, You may try for yourself Whether you can help him!

 $^1\mathrm{To}$  this encounter with the giant there is a striking parallel in Crestien's  $\mathit{Erec},$  ll. 4381 ff. For this reference I am indebted to Professor T. Atkinson Jenkins, of the University of Chicago.

The duke, of course, accepts the challenge, and that very instant the giant hurls a big bar at him, and so violently that his shield is completely shattered. By a turn of his ring the duke vanishes from the sight of his adversary, and then, with a vehemence that causes the mountains and valleys to shake, he rushes upon him, fells him to the ground, and cuts off his head. By another turn of the ring he becomes visible again to the knight and his lady. He releases them both, and both are profuse in their thanks to him, offering to serve him with all their possessions. [943–1070.]

Upon inquiry Frederick learns that the man is Gamorin, king of Scotland [the son of Leunemin]. In the course of the conversation he soon reveals his own identity, whereupon the lady bursts out in joy: "My dear kinsman, Sir Frederick!" By "kinsman" she means "cousin," for her father (who is king of England) and the duke's father are brothers. Naturally, Frederick is very glad to meet her also, for neither one had seen the other for twelve years. King Gamorin now informs the duke that he and his queen are on their way to attend court between England and Brittany; that very distinguished guests are to be there from England, Scotland, France, and Ireland; and that tournaments are to be held at the same occasion. This last news inspires Frederick with a desire to accompany them. [1071-1250.]

The three ride on together to Bramundant, the castle of Count Askalias. As soon as they arrive King Gamorin begins to relate to the count the details of his adventure with the giant, including the fact that both he and his queen had been saved through the timely intervention of the duke. Askalias is very glad to have the giant-slayer as a guest, for this same giant had killed his son, a young man of such pre-eminent knightly qualities that he had been dubbed knight even before he was twenty years of age. [1251-1376.]

The following day, while riding together, Gamorin is asked by Frederick to relate some adventure that he may have had, and the king tells of how he had once found a lady in a wide forest between England and Scotland. She was sitting beside a dead knight, pressing him sorrowfully to her breast. With sobs and tears she told Gamorin that the knight who had been killed was the late Sir Lifant, duke of Ireland, and that she was Arilla, a niece of the king of Ireland. Gamorin then took her to a city nearby, where he procured lodging for her for the night. The next morning they harnessed four horses and drove the shortest way to Ireland, where Gamorin was royally entertained by the king for eight days. While there he learned that the king had a daughter, the fairest in the land, but that she was kept high up in a tower and carefully guarded by attending ladies, for the king did not wish her to be seen by any man, save himself.—After listening to this narration Frederick is seized with a desire to possess the Irish princess. [1377–1512.]

King Gamorin and the duke continue on their way to Verona and arrive there at the right time for the big tournament. The city is the scene of a great concourse of the nobility: Beviand, duke of Scotland, brought 100 knights; the king of England brought 300; Sir Arrik of Taestergala, even more; and the king of France came with 6,000 men. Besides, there were the following knights: Sir Maliz of Tenalabrok (Cenalabrok), Gawain, Segremors, Orillus, Lewis, Visrezat, and Vigolis. [1513–1640.]

The tournament begins that same night, and the first combat is fought between Gamorin and Count Puenzin, each wearing the other out without a decisive victory on either side. Next, Gamorin vanquishes Leuiz (Lewis?) but is in turn dashed from his horse by a thrust from Gawain's hand. Seeing this, Sir Beviand rushes forward, and a prolonged combat ensues between him and Sir Orik, until Beviand finally falls from his horse. Then Frederick dashes against Orik, whom he already knew; their lances are shattered again and again, but the combat ends with honors equal. Now Tidonas turns upon Frederick, but is quickly vanquished. On the opposite side the king of England is fighting with one after the other, including the king of France, with whom he divides honors. This ends the tournament for that day. [1641–1768.]

Before the tourney was resumed the next morning, Frederick attended mass and prayed God to shield him from danger that day. As soon as he comes out on the jousting-field he engages Gawain, but neither one is able to wrest a victory from the other. Then Segremors turns upon the duke, but he and his horse are both thrown to the ground. A general fight ensues which rages so fiercely that in it "more lances were destroyed than were ever known to exist in a single city." Toward the close of the contest Beviand's enemies begin to crowd him away, but are intercepted by Frederick, who "cuts and strikes with both hands." Later, when the duke is threatened by the same danger, he is saved through the timely intervention of Gamorin. In the affray Lanzelaer is thrown from his horse but regains it with the assistance of friends. This ends the tourney of the second day. At the close of the tournament Gamorin invites Frederick to pay him a visit, but the latter declines the invitation, for he is now bent upon going to Ireland. [1769–1889.]

When he arrives at the Irish court he is received with all due honors though, of course, without seeing the king's daughter. After some days, a number of guests arrive from the tournament in Verona, and when they see the duke they are delighted to meet him. In his behalf they

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Cf. "Destregâles" ("Destrigâles"), the name of Erec's native country, in Hartmann's Erec, ll. 1818, 2864, 9373, 10032; also the form "Destrigleis," in Wolfram's Parzival, VII, 1336. Concerning the latter name Bartsch (Deutsche Classiker des Mittelalters, X, Leipzig, 1876, p. 50, note) says: "Destrigleis aus Hartmanns Erec entnommen, wo der Name Destrigales, Destregales (aus d'estre-Gales, das Land über Gales hinaus) lautet." May we not then connect Arrik of Taestergala and Erec d'estre-Gales?

testify before the king that "in all the world there is no prouder knight" than he, and this testimony induces the king to order the best of accommodations for him. The knights and swains who are commissioned to attend to his needs very soon become his friends, and one day he ventures to ask them "how it might be" with the maiden up in the tower. He is told of her unrivaled beauty and of the strict rule against her being seen by any man, save the king himself; also that most of the king's valuables are kept up in the same tower. [1890-1966.]

While food is being brought to Floria the next evening, Frederick turns his ring and enters the room unseen. After the girl has taken her food the twelve women attendants bring in the bed in which she is to sleep; then all the women, except the governess, retire. When everything is quiet the duke is seized with an irrepressible desire of kissing the girl, "even though it should be his death." As he kisses her she calls her governess and screams, "Oh woe is me! I know not what is lying so near me here!" The women rush in, but naturally all search for the intruder is fruitless. This kind of disturbance is repeated until the governess tells Floria that if she causes any further trouble she will whip her until "the blood flows." The duke remains with the girl and she becomes quiet, yet the governess begins to put her threat into effect, when the other women intervene, and Floria promises to incommode them no more, though she might live a thousand years. [1967-2104.]

In the morning Frederick assumes visible form, Floria confesses her love to him, and he promises to make her duchess of Normandy. Before leaving the tower he notices the large supply of costly silks and the many "thousand hundred pounds of clear gold" that are kept there. Of both he takes whatever he can carry, and later distributes the booty among his chosen twelve knights and thirty-odd trusted squires. Meanwhile he causes messages to be sent to Gamorin, requesting him to come, and as soon as he learns of his friend's arrival he commands his private knights to assist him in the flight which he is about to make with Floria. The landlord (or steward) is told to keep in readiness a ship with accommodations for at least one hundred men and with provisions for a whole year. [2105–2270.]

The next evening, after bidding farewell to the king—who is sorry to see him leave so soon—Frederick proceeds to take Floria from the the tower. He steps into a boat, has it brought over to the drawbridge, goes up to the tower and carries down so much gold that one of the squires asks him to desist, for fear of its causing the boat to sink. He then fetches Floria and her trusted maid, and gives orders to sail away as fast as possible.¹ A little way out at sea his company meet Gamorin

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Compare the flight, the angered king, etc., with the following "Bruchstück eines niederrheinischen epischen Gedichtes" (published by Karl Bartsch, Germania, V, pp. 356 ff.). According to Bartsch, the fragment (118 lines) belongs to the cycle of poems

and Belafir, who take both the duke and the girl on board their ship. Presently Frederick is seen walking out on the deck, when a high wind comes up and tosses him into the sea. King Gamorin's company mourn him as lost, and in her grief Floria tries to jump overboard, being caught in time by the king himself. Having concluded that nothing can be done to save the duke, his friends proceed to Scotland. [2271–2432.]

The following morning, when the Irish king learns of his daughter's flight with Frederick, he becomes furious, upbraids the women in attendance and even threatens to have them summarily put to death, so that the queen has to intercede for them and quiet his rage. He then calls the steward to explain, but the latter assures the king that in his services to the duke he has done nothing more than obey orders. Hereupon the king summons his knights and squires, bidding them prepare four ships, On these ships four hundred men set out in pursuit of the duke, with orders through the chancellor to kill both him and his company, if caught. After a few hours sailing, the men espy the duke sitting on the water totally unharmed. The pilot throws out a hook and lifts him on board. [2433–2516.]

Asked by the chancellor concerning the whereabouts of Floria. Frederick replies that he does not know. In a rage over this curt reply the chancellor puts a sword into the hands of a strong squire, who makes a futile attempt at beheading the duke. Disappointed, the chancellor then has him put in irons and gives orders to return home. On the return voyage the duke is again asked to explain where Floria might be, and he answers that she and her whole company are drowned. Failing

which connect romantic adventures and expeditions with the names of historic personages and places. I give a translation of Bartsch's summary of the contents. "On an expedition to the Orient, Heinrich, duke of Normandy, had won the love of Claredamie the daughter of the king of Mec (Mecca?), and had induced her to accept the Christian faith. Claredamie sent word to her mother that unless she also would become a Christian she would never see her daughter again. In her message the girl declared the heathen gods to be nothing but powerless gold, silver, and stone, as was seen when Maumet (Mahmet) had to bear the disgrace of being dashed to pieces by her lover. If the mother would comply with her wishes, she said, she would be willing to have a conference with her at whatever place she might appoint. On receiving this message, the queen was so grieved at the thought of losing her only child that she decided to renounce her own faith in the heathen gods. After she had been baptized, she was most cordially received by Claredamie. In order that the duke might cherish the most tender feelings toward her daughter, the queen made him a gift of two thousand pounds of gold, and then returned to her country. When the king of Mec heard that the queen had permitted herself to be baptized, he flew into a rage and, forgetting his honor, killed her. A war ensued between the heathens and Christians, which lasted for seven years; then Heinrich desired to return to his own country with Claredamie. His nephew Melantwier, with his amie, joined him. Before departing, Heinrich and his company bestowed gifts on the Christian poor of the land, and after commending King Amerade to the protection of God, the four set out by sea from Jerusalem to Normandy. Here they were received with great joy and splendor by the lords and ladies of the land. Thereupon Heinrich sent messengers into the countries round about to proclaim a tourney in honor of the two ladies he had brought with him."

to satisfy the chancellor with this reply he is told that he must die. [2517-2560.]

When the men come back to the king's city the duke is immediately thrown upon a large burning pyre; but thanks to his magic ring he again comes out unharmed, although his clothes are burned from his body. The chancellor, however, is so sure of his case that he hastens to inform the king of the burning of the duke. Meanwhile, the latter goes up to the palace, puts on the best of the king's clothes, takes from the royal stalls the very best horse to be had, and rides away to Scotland, where the joy of his friends, particularly that of Floria, is unbounded. In honor of the event court is held for fourteen days. [2561-2654.]

When Frederick and his bride-to-be are about to leave for Normandy, the king of Scotland showers upon them numerous gifts, including a camel for carrying their many treasures. Besides, Floria is given a retinue of forty ladies and the duke is given a hundred knights as companions. Two swains are sent on to Normandy in advance, to announce the coming of the noble couple, and when they arrive great joy prevails among all the people, so dearly did they love their duke. His lords present him with many thousand pounds, but this money he in turn gives to the knights and ladies who have come from Scotland. Once more court is held for fourteen days, and after this session of court his Scotch friends return home. [2655–2718.]

The following spring Frederick sends messages in every direction, inviting the lords and princes to come to his wedding at Whitsuntide. To accommodate the visitors, a number of tents are put up on a broad plain. Here the guests assemble at the appointed time: the king of France with a hundred knights; the king of Scotland with two hundred knights; the king of Ireland—who is especially glad to come and see his daughter still alive—brings two hundred knights; Sir Lielin of Gascogny arrives with one hundred knights, and all the lords bring their wives. Lastly, there comes a rich king who has with him more people than all the others, and in pomp and splendor his appearance greatly excels that of the other kings: it is Malnrit, king of the dwarfs. [2719–2932.]

According to agreement with the duke, King Malnrit has his tents pitched along the banks of a river, and when they are ready the great flood of light which pours out from them turns night into day. On each of the knobs (on the tent-poles?) there are two carbuncles and four rubies; from these and other precious stones such intense light is given off that, in comparison, a lighted torch is like darkness itself. The queen's tent is the most gorgeous one of all: around it in a wide circle is spread a velvet mat which is studded with gems, and the queen herself is attired in a scarlet robe, and so are the court ladies. The knights all ride on blood-red steeds, and before them hosts of drummers are marching, and trumpeters, and all kinds of musicians.—The celebration

is concluded with a generous distribution of gold, precious stones, and scarlet robes among the visitors. [2933–3054.]

The wedding festivities were followed by a session of court for three weeks, and at the conclusion of this session the king of Ireland entrusted not only his daughter, but also his whole kingdom into Frederick's hands. The duke, in turn, transferred Normandy to a lord in whom he placed confidence, and then departed with his father-in-law for Ireland. Within a year from that time the king died, and Frederick ascended the throne, proving himself to be a model ruler who built churches and monasteries and in this way soon won the love and esteem of all his lords. Two sons and one daughter were born to him, and after a reign of fourteen years and three months he died. What became of the magic ring is not known, nor is it known how long the elder son ruled. The younger son was made duke of Normandy, and the daughter married the king of Spain. Floria, the widowed queen, entered a convent, where she remained the rest of her life.—Herewith the story ends. [3055-3200.]

Judged on the basis of poetic beauty and excellence, "Duke Frederick" is conceded to be a work of comparatively small importance. In this the critics appear to be of one mind. Speaking of it in comparison with the other two Eufemia songs, Henrik Schück1 says that it lies more remote than either of these from the genuine world of legendary lore. He believes that it was written by a German poet who had read many popular contemporary French stories of chivalry; these he imitated in his own work. Nyerup2 was so unfavorably impressed with the story that he condemned it outright, declaring it to be "drawn out to excess, wholly lacking in savor, and altogether uninteresting." Gumaelius<sup>3</sup> is less severe in his He believes that in the construction of the plot, in the variety of episodes, and in the peculiar naïveté of its narration enough of the poetic qualities of the original have survived in the translation to make at least one reading of it enjoyable. He admits, however, that a work like the "Iwain," with its wealth and variety of episode. and its vivid descriptions, is far more entertaining; and that the "Flores and Blanchflor" excels in the portrayal of pure, ardent love and unbroken fidelity. At best, "Duke Frederick" may be likened to a plant that has been moved from a milder zone to the less fertile

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Introduction to Vol. I of his Sveriges Medeltidesagor, Stockholm, 1893.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> In Museum für altdeutsche Litteratur, Bd. II (1811), p. 328.

<sup>3</sup> In Iduna, IX (1822), pp. 121 f.

soil and the more severe climate of a foreign land: the delicacy of fragrance and wealth of colors which it may have had in common with most productions of the South have vanished before the cutting winds of the North.

Apart from all considerations of poetic merit, this mediaeval romance commands attention in its own way. To the student of Scandinavian literature, particular interest attaches to it from the linguistic point of view, for its language is contemporaneous with that of the old rhymed chronicles. It is, therefore, one of the few monuments that mark a period of transition, when many of the older Norse words, phrases, and forms of inflection began to be supplanted by the German. Its importance historically should not be measured by the light which it may shed upon mediaeval customs; such light can be drawn to better advantage from the native productions of France or Germany. Its historical value is rather to be sought in the additional evidence which it affords of the lively intellectual intercourse that existed between Northern and Southern Europe, a century or even more before the Renaissance. Considering this close relationship between the different nations of Europe, it is indeed surprising that Sweden, a comparatively obscure corner of the continent, should be the only country in which the work has been preserved to the present day.

EDWARD THORSTENBERG

YALE UNIVERSITY



# HEBBEL'S USE OF THE HEXAMETER IN "MUTTER UND KIND"

It is proposed in this investigation to determine by an examination of the metrical structure of Hebbel's epic, Mutter und Kind, the views which the poet entertained with respect to the hexameter, and to what extent he applied his principles in the writing of the poem. Such an investigation involves chiefly such questions as the relationship of the German hexameter and the Greek; in what respects and to what extent Hebbel followed Greek models, and how far he deemed it necessary, in view of the exigencies of the German language, to depart from classic models; whether, in line with such rigorists as Voss and later Wilhelm Schlegel and Platen, he modeled his verse closely after the principles of the ancients, or whether, with Goethe and Schiller, he admitted such metrical innovations as he deemed expedient in the adaptation of the verse to the German language.

The hexameter, being a verse composed of feet of a varying number of syllables, cannot depend solely on a regular succession of accented and unaccented syllables to sustain its rhythm. It demands also of the poet that he give due attention to time measure (Taktdauer). The ideal hexameter would be one, each foot of which, when declaimed naturally, consumes an equal interval of time in the reading. In addition the arsis of each foot should be so well marked by the accent that it would stand out sharply in contrast to the thesis. Of decided importance is the element of the time measure. One has but to declaim an imperfect hexameter to note the natural tendency to dwell on feet composed of short syllables, and conversely to suppress heavy stem syllables in the thesis, and thus, by a method of compensatory lengthenings and shortenings, force each foot into the time measure. In Hebbel's verse—

Als mein Vater sie kennte, und seine goldenen Regeln

the fourth foot is too short. In reading one naturally stretches out the arsis in order to bring the foot into time with the dactyl of the preceding foot. If one recognizes the importance of the time measure in sustaining the rhythm of the hexameter, there arises next the question of how this uniformity is to be attained in German. Minor demonstrates convincingly that there is no constant relationship between time measure (Taktdauer) and syllable quantity. The natural quantity of the German syllable is too variable for it to assure uniformity of time measure. The position and environment of a syllable play a large rôle in determining its length. Many compounds have a different length when resolved into their elements. In parallelism and repetition a word of two syllables may often be unaccented and thus lose in quantity.

Closely related to the subject of time measure is the oft-discussed question as to whether or not the trochee is admissable in the hexameter. Goethe in Reineke Fuchs and in Hermann und Dorothea and Schiller in his hexameters used trochees generously. Later Goethe, acting on suggestions from Wilhelm Schlegel, in his Elegies approached more nearly to classic models. Schlegel was at first for admitting trochees under certain conditions, but he later became more rigorous and like Platen demanded the absolute exclusion of the trochee from the hexameter. But the question may not be settled thus by a dogmatic acceptance or rejection of the trochee.

It is just here that the question of the time measure plays its principal rôle. If a trochee can be found which fills out the time measure of the foot, then the rhythm will not be marred. And the non-constant quality of the German syllable makes this possible. The indefinite article eine as a verse foot will always do violence to the rhythm. It is capable of being shortened but not prolonged. But trochees may be admitted in the hexameter which have an arsis capable of being long sustained, or a thesis with a full vowel or a strong consonant. A natural pause between the two elements of the foot may also fill out the time interval of the foot. It is thus evident that the trochee can neither be generally excluded nor indiscriminately admitted in the hexameter. Each case must be judged separately.

An investigation of Hebbel's hexameters begins naturally with the variants of the MSS. Taking these variants as a starting-point

<sup>1</sup> J. Minor, Neuhochdeutsche Metrik (Strassburg, 1902), S. 281 ff.

one may note what metrical defects were apparent to the poet himself, and in what spirit and to what extent he corrected these deficiencies. It is at once evident that the question of the trochee was his chief difficulty. By far the largest number of his corrections deal with the trochee. It is also interesting to note that he approaches the correction of faulty trochees in a spirit quite in sympathy with Minor's view of their admissibility in the hexameter. In many cases dactyls are substituted for trochees, in others spondees are introduced, and in still others heavier and longer trochees take the place of the original foot which was not quantitatively long enough to fill out the time measure. The poem is not purged of short trochees, but where the correction of a faulty foot was possible without doing violence to the passage in question Hebbel generally made it. In some cases a revision has been undertaken in order to eliminate a succession of short trochees. In other cases the revision affects only one trochee. In the first group of citations such cases are given in which a dactyl is substituted for the original trochee where the trochee was so weak as not to fill out the time measure of the foot. In the following citations the first version gives the original reading and the second Hebbel's revision.

- 1 Eben graut der Morgen u. s. w. Eben Grauet der Morgen u. s. w.
- 14 Schwören bloss, zur Nacht die Raupen noch voller zu stopfen Schwören sich bloss, zur Nacht u. s. w.
- 61 Selten ruhig zu Hause u. s. w. Selten gemächlich zu Hause u. s. w.
- 77 Aber wem es Gott im liebsten Freunde und Bruder Aber wem es der Herr im u. s. w.
- 78 Vor die Augen stellt, dem ziemt es sich warnen zu lassen Dicht vor die Augen stellt, u. s. w.
- 79 Hätte Wilhelm mich in solchem Elend gesehen Hätte der Ärmste mich u. s. w.

In addition to the above citations there are 48 other verses in the poem in which Hebbel has eliminated a weak trochee and substituted in its stead a dactyl.

In the next group of citations a weak trochee is strengthened. In some cases this is accomplished by the substitution of a spondee. In others the foot still remains quantitatively a trochee, but its elements are capable of a natural prolongation in enunciation. In some cases a natural pause occurs between the two elements of the foot, thus filling out the time measure.

1867 Wie die Hunde bei uns! Denn wäre der Schmied ein Franzose Wie die Hunde bei uns! Denn wäre der Schmied ein Franzmann

8 Wie der Hahn auch rufe, der nicht bequem auf der Latte Wie der Hahn auch rufe, und wie vom Thurme herunter

The trochee of the fourth foot is strengthened in the revision.

1960 Und sie gingen in Trauer! Dann habt Ihr nichts zu besorgen
 Und sie gingen in Trauer! Mich dünkt ich sehe den Todten

The natural pause between the arsis and the thesis of the fourth foot in the revision makes an improvement over the original.

Besides the above cases 14 other revisions of faulty trochees are accomplished in the poem by the introduction of a foot of two syllables, in which the two syllabic elements are either long or capable of prolongation, or between the elements of which there occurs a natural pause.

Taking the sum total of these corrections which deal with the trochee, Hebbel's view of the admissibility of the trochee in the hexameter begins to make itself apparent. He recognized evidently that the natural quantity of the syllable plays a large rôle in the hexameter. But it was also evident to him that the strict following of the principles of natural syllable quantity in the spirit of the ancients could not be made the standard of excellence for the verse foot of the hexameter. Hebbel made 71 corrections of weak trochees. Fifty-four of the original trochees were replaced by dactyls. The remaining 17 were simply strengthened. As was noted before, these corrections by no means purged the poem of faulty trochees. But such do not abound. In the first 100 verses of Mutter und Kind there are 14 cases of such weak trochees. In the first 100 verses of Hermann und Dorothea there are 25 trochees which are open to the same criticism.

A number of Hebbel's revisions are concerned with the dactyls. Just as the trochee may mar the rhythm of the verse if it is too weak to fill out the time measure, so also a heavy dactyl of the form \_\_\_ or \_\_ may destroy the rhythm by overflowing the time measure. The following group of citations shows revisions undertaken

in the interest of the quantity and in some cases of the accent of the dactyl. In some cases the dactyl gives way to a spondee or trochee. In other cases a better dactyl is substituted for the defective original.

94 Abgefallen! Ich glaubte im Anfang, es wäre sein Vater Die nicht denken! Ich glaubte zuerst, es wäre sein Vater

In the original the daetyl of the fourth foot is of the form  $\dot{-} \dot{-} \dot{-}$ . The quantity of the foot is further increased by the feminine caesura. Hebbel substitutes a spondee in the revision.

109 Darum lässt er sie sitzen u. s. w. Darum bleiben sie sitzen u. s. w.

The revision improves the accent of the arsis and shortens the syllables of the thesis.

130 Wenn sich der Arme es wagt, ein Gatte und Vater zu werden Wenn der Arme es wagt, ein Gatte und Vater zu werden

The initial dactyl was too long and the accent uncertain because of the series of monosyllabic words.

Thirty-three verses in all have been similarly revised in order to improve faulty dactyls.

Besides these revisions of trochees and dactyls Hebbel has made two changes in his MSS to avoid the caesura at the end of the third foot. This caesura was avoided by the Greeks as well as by most of the writers of German hexameters:

17 Aber wer könnte sie tadeln, dass sie noch einmal sich umdreh'n Aber wer könnte sie tadeln dass sie sich noch einmal herumdreh'n

The verse gains little in the revision. The dactyls of the third and fourth feet are too heavy and the accent of the fourth foot is not well defined.

276 Dennoch irrt er gewaltig, wenn er das Knattern des Bodens Dennoch irrt er gewaltig, indem er das Knattern des Bodens

Five verses are revised to avoid hiatus: 309, 720, 1024, 1028, and 1632.

Reviewing Hebbel's revisions, both of trochees and dactyls, one is in position to judge of his theory of the relationship of time measure and syllable quantity. It is evident that he is not a rigorist like Voss or Platen. He employs in his verse both short trochees and long dactyls which the rigorists would have condemned. But he also eliminates from his verses many defective trochees and numerous faulty dactyls. And here he is just in line with Goethe and the method which the latter employed in his hexameter. That which distinctly characterizes Hebbel's revisions is his recognition of the importance of time measure (Taktdauer) in sustaining the rhythm of the hexameter. Schlegel rejects a trochee because it is too short. But if a trochee, when declaimed naturally, can be made to fill out the same time interval as the other feet of the verse, then that trochee makes a good verse foot. Hebbel substitutes in several cases just such a trochee in place of a dactyl. Most often he makes the trochee measure up to the Taktdauer by choosing one between the elements of which there occurs a slight pause. This is the best testimony to the fact that Hebbel recognized the necessity of uniformity of Taktdauer in the hexameter. A long syllable in the arsis, plus a natural pause, plus a short syllable, may be taken as the formula for many of the trochees in Mutter und Kind. Such trochees meet all the requirements of a good verse foot for the hexameter. Evidence of the recognition of the same principle is the frequency with which Hebbel discards dactyls which involve a natural pause between the two elements of the foot. A dactyl of the form ±=, - (the comma represents the pause) would overflow the time measure. Whether Hebbel ever actually formulated the principle of subjecting his verse feet to this criterion of the time measure, and whether he recognized that time measure is often independent of syllable quantity, is immaterial as far as the result is concerned. If he depended solely on the accuracy of his ear the latter guided him in quite the right direction.

Hebbel, like Goethe, makes skilful use of the caesura to give variety to his verse. It may fall at the end of a simple sentence, 23, 41, 55; or it may precede an infinitive, 14, 78, 95; or it may come before a participial clause, 46, 70, 115; or it may separate the parts of a compound sentence, 10, 17, 25.

In 590 verses of the poem the caesura occurs after the accented syllable of the third foot (masculine caesura). In 542 cases (the poem contains in all 2,075 verses) the caesura falls after the first

unaccented syllable of the third foot (feminine caesura). In 559 verses there is a secondary caesura, the two pauses being variously distributed throughout the verse. Of frequent occurrence is the combination where the caesura occurs in the first and third feet of the verse, the verse being often introduced by a conjunction or expletive which gives rise to a natural pause.

16 Nun, man müsste sie loben, wofern sie sich rascher erhüben.

Again, the two caesuras may occur in the first and fifth feet, in the second and fourth, or often in successive feet. In 83 verses we find the caesura in the second foot; in 177 verses it occurs in the fourth foot; while there are 56 cases of a single caesura in the fifth foot.

Goethe has comparatively few verses in Hermann und Dorothea in which there are three pauses. In Hebbel's poem there are in the first canto alone 22 verses in which there are three necessary pauses (the first canto has 244 verses in all). The effect produced is to disjoint the verse and make it lose the essential character of the rhythm of the hexameter. This, it would appear, was obvious to Hebbel also, for in the second canto there are eight such verses, while in the fifth there are only three. In the entire poem there are 61 such verses. It appears therefore that Hebbel recognized this defect in the earlier verses of the poem and sought to avoid it later as he proceeded with his work.

Seventy-five cases of the bucolic dieresis occur in the poem, sometimes in conjunction with a secondary caesura and sometimes as the sole pause in the verse.

The feminine caesura in the fourth foot was avoided by the Greeks. W. Schlegel noted that the two short syllables of the fourth foot usually formed with the preceding or following syllable a complete word. In the Latin hexameter the feminine caesura in the fourth foot appears commonly as the caesura regens. Klopstock makes use of it, but Voss, always a close follower of the Greeks, avoided it. Goethe used it nowhere very generously. There are 24 instances of it in the first 500 verses of Hermann und Dorothea. Later, acting on the advice of Schlegel, he admitted its illegitimacy and revised various passages in the Elegies to avoid it. Hebbel

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> J. W. Scholl, "Goethe and Schlegel's Epic and Elegiac Verse," Journal of English and Germanic Philology, July, 1908.

seems to have had no convictions against the use of it. There are 39 examples of the feminine caesura in the fourth foot in the first 500 verses of *Mutter und Kind*. None of his revisions reveal any attempt to avoid it.

The Greek hexameter did not permit the caesura at the end of the third foot, the result in such a case being not a jointed verse but two new verses each containing half the number of feet of the original verse. Makers of German hexameters have for the most part followed this law. Certain of Hebbel's revisions already noted have dealt with this difficulty. There are not more than a dozen verses in the whole poem which are thus divided in half by the caesura. And in several of these cases he has so combined this caesura with a secondary pause as to avoid the unpleasant effect of the division of the verse into two equal parts:

248 Nach der Kälte nicht fragend, nur nach der Stunde, verdriesslich. Here the unpleasant effect of the caesura at the end of the third foot is avoided by the presence of a secondary caesura in the fifth foot, the whole verse having *enjambement*. Other verses equally divided are 825, 938, 1,521, 1,964, etc.

In a few verses Hebbel has two pauses in the third foot:

735 Dieses gelt' uns als Zeichen! Doch, wie sie auch immer sich fassen.

In a few others the caesura is somewhat difficult to place with certainty:

815 Californien ist der offene Rachen der Hölle.

Minor makes interesting statistics dealing with what he calls the osteological construction of the Greek, Latin, and German hexameter. The proportion of feet of three syllables to those of two is in Homer 68:32. In Virgil the proportion is 40:60. Klopstock's Messias is closer to Homer than to Virgil, the proportion being 61:39. In Voss's Homer the proportion is 60:40. The same author's Luise shows the proportion 65:35. In Goethe's Reineke Fuchs the proportion is 49:51, and in Hermann und Dorothea 51:49. It will be seen then that Goethe's hexameters preserve the mean between Homer, in which feet of three syllables predominate, and Virgil, in whose verses feet of two syllables occur most frequently. In Hebbel's poem the proportion of dactyls to feet of two syllables is 65:59.

Hebbel's hexameters are therefore in this respect more closely akin to Goethe's than to those of Homer, Klopstock, and Voss. In other words, his verses show an increased use of feet of two syllables.

Considering the verse as a whole, we find in Homer, as between dactyls, spondees, and verses equally divided between the two, the following proportions: 7 (spondees): 61 (dactyls): 32 (equally divided). In the Latin hexameter the proportions are 40:20:40, Virgil being the representative. In Klopstock's verse the proportions are 13:47:40. Voss's Homer translation is almost like the Messias, the proportions being 12:44:44, but the Luise is more like the Homeric hexameter with the proportions 6:57:37. Goethe differs in this respect also from Homer, Klopstock, and Voss, his verses showing a predominatingly trochaic or spondaic rhythm, and in this point approaching more closely Latin models. The proportion in Reineke Fuchs is 32:24:44. In Hermann und Dorothea the same harmonious equilibrium prevails, the proportion being 27:28:45. And here again we find Hebbel's verse closely akin to Goethe's. In Mutter und Kind the ratio between trochees, dactyls, and verses in which feet of two and those of three syllables are equally divided, is 28 (trochees): 25 (dactyls): 47 (equally divided).

Considering the single verse feet we find the following relationships to exist in the first foot. In Homer the proportion of dactyls to spondees is in the first foot 60:40. In Virgil these proportions are exactly reversed and the proportions are 40:60. Klopstock's verse shows the proportions 52:48; Voss's Homer translation 54:46; and the latter's Luise 59:41. In Goethe's hexameters we find again a digression from the Greek models followed by Klopstock and Voss and an approach to the Latin. In Reineke Fuchs the proportions are 32:68, and in Hermann und Dorothea 27:73. In Hebbel's poem the proportion of dactyls to feet of two syllables is 40:63. He thus departs from the Greek usage and the strict imitators of the Greek models, but not so radically as Goethe in this respect.

In the second foot the proportion of dactyls to spondees is in Homer 60:40; in Virgil 46:54; in Klopstock's Messias 71:29; in Voss' Homer 65:35; and in the latter's Luise 73:28. In Reineke Fuchs the proportion of dactyls to trochees or spondees is in the second foot 77:28, and in Hermann und Dorothea 80:20. Hebbel is

again in line with Goethe with the proportions 83:20. The German hexameter in general prefers a dactyl in the second foot. Götzinger¹ finds the explanation in the fact that the caesura usually occurs in the third foot (near the middle of the verse) and gives rise to a rhythm which is momentarily rising in character. If the caesura occurs in a dactylic foot it must be either of the form -/~~- or -~/~-, and in each case a rising inflection is produced. The natural falling rhythm of the hexameter is best brought out by a dactyl in the second and fifth feet; hence the predominance of the dactyl in the second foot.

In the third foot we find in Homer 84 dactyls to every 16 spondees. In Virgil the proportion is 40:60. Klopstock and Voss follow again the Greek models, the proportion being in the Messias 72:28, in Voss's Homer 69:31, and in the Luise 65:35. In Reineke Fuchs there there are 55 dactyls to every 45 trochees in the third foot. In Hermann und Dorothea these proportions are exactly reversed. In Mutter und Kind there are in the third foot 49 dactyls to every 55 trochees. Hebbel again follows Goethe in Hermann und Dorothea.

In the fourth foot Homer shows the proportions 68:40. The Latin hexameter departs again radically from the Greek. In Virgil the proportion of dactyls to spondees in the fourth foot is 29:71. Klopstock also gives the spondee a slight preference in the fourth foot. The proportion in the Messias is 48:52. In Voss's Homer there are 51 dactyls to every 40 trochees, but in the Luise the proportion is 63:37. Goethe prefers Klopstock's and Voss's usage here. The proportions in Reineke Fuchs is 31:69, and in Hermann und Dorothea 42:58. Hebbel's hexameters show in this point also their relationship to Goethe's, specifically to Hermann und Dorothea. In Mutter und Kind there are in the fourth foot 50 dactyls to every 53 trochees.

Reviewing these statistics of the dactyls, trochees, and spondees, we find that Goethe in the second foot gives the preference to the dactyl. In the third and fourth feet, however, he prefers the foot of two syllables, his hexameters being in this respect more closely related to the Latin than to the Greek models. Goethe's decided fondness for the trochee in the first foot is entirely new in the history

 $<sup>^1\</sup>mathrm{M}.$  Götzinger, Die deutsche Sprache und ihre Literatur (Stuttgart, 1839), II. Tell, S. 565 ff.

of the German hexameter. In each of these points we find Hebbel's verse closely related to Goethe's. Hebbel prefers the dactyl in the second foot, gives the preponderance to the trochee in the third and fourth feet, and shares Goethe's fondness for the trochee in the first foot. If we use the letter d to indicate a dactyl and the letter t to represent a trochee (or a spondee), it will be found that Goethe's favorite form for the hexameter is tdttdt. This is also Hebbel's favorite verse form. Out of 2,075 verses 311 are cast in this form, sixteen forms being possible, and all of them having representation in the poem. This is undoubtedly the form of the hexameter which yields the smoothest verse in German. The caesura usually falls near the middle of the verse. Therefore the falling cadence of the hexameter is best achieved by dactyls in the second and fifth feet.

Summing up results from the foregoing it becomes apparent that Hebbel in the making of his hexameters followed Hermann und Dorothea rather closely. His attitude with respect to syllable quantity is practically the same as that of Goethe. Hebbel was not a rigorist like Voss or Platen. He used both short trochees and long dactyls generously. But his revisions reveal a very sane view with respect to time measure and syllable quantity. Like Goethe, where it was possible without doing violence to the passage in question, he revised weak trochees and heavy dactyls. And these revisions are apparently based on an accurate sense for time measure. That is to say, a good verse was one in which each foot, when enunciated naturally, filled out an equal time interval. If a dactyl or trochee filled out the time measure naturally it was a good verse-foot. If it did not fill out this time interval, or if it overflowed it, it was not a good versefoot. Hebbel recognized also that natural syllable quantity, even when strictly adhered to in the making of dactyls and spondees, did not always insure uniformity of time measure. A dactyl with more than one long syllable is under certain conditions metrically possible in the hexameter. And a trochee may also under conditions measure up to the standard of a good verse-foot for the hexameter.

Hebbel follows the rigorists in avoiding verses with the caesura after the third foot. In no other respects is he at pains to observe their dicta. For example, he makes no effort to avoid the feminine caesura in the fourth foot, in this point not even following Goethe,

who admitted its illegitimacy but did not always avoid it. With respect to the osteological construction of the hexameter Hebbel follows Goethe also. As compared with the Greek hexameter and its imitators Goethe and Hebbel employ far more feet of two syllables than the former. Trochees predominate in the third and fourth feet as well as in the first, in which last innovation Hebbel again follows Goethe.

Hebbel evidently took *Hermann und Dorothea* for his model. It may be said of the result that *Mutter und Kind* from a metrical standpoint is very well worthy of being compared with Goethe's epic.

PALMER COBB

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA

## GUIDO CAVALCANTI'S ODE OF LOVE

The following translation is an attempt to render as literally as possible in the original meter the famous philosophical poem of Dante's "first friend." The rendering itself, with the notes, implies necessarily an interpretation of Guido's philosophy; but the present occasion does not seem appropriate to expand or justify that interpretation.

The Ode itself probably is in answer to the following sonnet, addressed, as the custom was, to Cavalcanti by a fellow-poet, Guido Orlandi.

## GUIDO ORLANDI TO GUIDO CAVALCANTI

Tell me, where is Love born and of what sire? Is't substance, quality, or remembrance, pray? What is its natural place, where it holds sway? Fancy of eye is it, or heart's desire? From what derives its temper or its ire? How is it felt as flame that wastes away? Also I ask, upon what does it prey? How, when, and over whom has it empire? What sort of thing, I say, is Love? has't feature? Wears it its own shape, or some counterfeit? And is it life, this Love, or is it death? Who serves it, should know somewhat of its nature: Wherefore I ask you, Guido, touching it: You're in its service seasoned, rumor saith.

#### ODE OF LOVE

#### BY CAVALCANTI

T

A Lady entreats me; wherefore I will tell Of a quality too frequently malign, Yet so divine that men have called it Love: Thus may the truth whatever doubt dispel. Adept I ask unto this task of mine,

Lady. In Convito III, 14, Dante interprets the donna gentil of his canzone as
"a soul noble in intellect and free in the exercise of its own proper power, which is reason."
Possibly, therefore, we may understand by the "Lady" who entreats Cavalcanti, the
rational soul, or intelligence, of Orlandi.

 Quality. An accidente is a contingent quality. Cavalcanti uses the term qualità for love in 1. 50.

4231

## JEFFERSON B. FLETCHER

For my design, I fear me, is above
His wit that is at heart of base degree.
For me proof philosophic is defined,
Else disinclined I feel me to recite
Where Love has place; created by what might;
And what its virtue is; and potency;
Verity essential; motions of what kind;
Its name assigned as Love for what delight;
And if it may be manifest to sight.

#### II

In that part where the memory resides
It makes appearance; as transparence shows
Through which light flows, so Love its form acquires
From shadow cast by Mars, the which abides.
Created hence; nature of sense bestows
Its name, and pose of soul, and heart's desire.
It comes from visible form, which, apprehended,
Ascended into passive intellect,
There, as affect, maintains its tenancy.
Never it works in that part injury.
And since from finite kind 'tis not descended,
Unended is its radiant effect.

15. Where the memory resides. I. e., the sensitive soul, according to Aristotle, where the image of the loved one is preserved; hence, modernly speaking, the imagination.

16-18. The lovable image is conceived as, so to speak, a silhouette in black upon the screen of the imagination, so symbolizing the "malignity" of love (cf. 1. 2). This "malignity" is further explained by deriving the "shadow" from Mars, the planet of wrath and perturbation, Cecco d'Ascoli in his Acerba, iii, 1, takes issue with this derivation of love, and reproves Dante for failing also to object. In fact, Dante in Convito, III, 19, does recant his own previous account of love as "malign" (fero): that view "sprang," he says, "from the infirmity of my mind which was impassioned by excessive longing." In Convito, II, 7, he derives love from the bright radiance of Venus. Cavalcanti, however, makes the very essence of love "excessive longing" (cf. II. 43, 44).

19. Created hence. Since love is excited by an outside force, i. e., literally or symbolically the influence of the planet Mars, it is not an original and permanent quality of the soul, but contingent (accidente) upon the action of that force.

19, 20. Nature of sense, etc. Love originates in the sensitive soul, and so has the same name and character and desire as sensual passion, though its object is quite different. The aim of all love is union with the thing beloved; but whereas sensual passion desires only physical union, love in the proper sense desires spiritual union. So Dante (Conv. III, 2): "Love, truly taken and subtly considered, is nought else than a spiritual union of the soul and of the loved thing."

21-23. The "visible form" or idea incarnate, is "apprehended," that is, its pure form or idea is abstracted from the material thing, and taken up into the passive intellect, or intellective memory, where it remains as a dominating ideal.

24. The action of this amorous ideal is not directly mental, i. e., ratiocinative or discursive, but obsessive of the attention and will: to speak modernly, it becomes a "fixed idea."

25, 26. Being of a pure form, or idea, which as infinite cannot be completely possessed by a finite being, love is never inactive through satiety.

Nor wears aspect of joy but reverie, For may not enter there affinity.

27, 28. Love cannot enjoy its ideal in the sense of fruition, as just said; its mood is an entranced contemplation of that ideal, a ravishment away from self toward it. Cavalcanti intends the same as the Piatonic "ecstasy." The "affinity" is the "ideal" as it exists objectively in the intelligible world, according to Plato, or in the "active intelligence" according to Aristotle. (Cf. 1. 75 and comment.)

#### III

It is not virtue, but from that proceeds Which is perfection, in complexion withal 30 Not rational, but feeling, I attest. The judgment Love against well-being leads, For ravishments intelligence enthrall. Discernment small it has where vice is guest. Often there follows from its puissance death, 35 If wrath o'ermuch the faculty dismay Which of the way adversative is ward: Not that with nature Love hath disaccord: But when to perfect good lies not its path, Who saith that life is his is led astray. 40 Lacking the stay which makes him his own lord. Nor less avails Love though it be ignored.

29-31. Virtue, moral or intellectual, is a rational perfection; love is not rational, but "feels." Its object, however, is not a sensation, but an idea; and to "feel" an idea is, modernly speaking, to "intuit." Love, then, is an intuitive perfection.

32, 33. Its intuitions of its ideal act, as said before, like "fixed ideas," dominating the judgment against the welfare of the organism; the mind is in a state of ecststic brooding (intersions).

35-37. Wrath (ira) (cf. ll. 51, 52), occasioned by the impossibility of fruition (cf. l. 28), may fatally impair the vital faculties. Cf. the exclamation of Dante's "natural spirit" at the first appearance of Beatrice, Heu miser! quia frequenter impeditus ero deinceps.

38-41. It is not love that works against nature, for, on the contrary, love is the very principle which moves nature; but it is, as said, the inability of love to reach its "perfect good," which causes the "wrath" which deprives the lover of the self-control without which self-preservation is impossible.

## IV

Its essence is whenas the passionate will
Beyond the measure of natural pleasure goes;
Then with repose forever is unblest.
Still fickle, smiles in tears it can fulfill,
And on the face leave pallid trace of woes.
Brief are its throes. Yet chiefly manifest
Thou shalt observe it in the nobly wise.

43, 44. Natural pleasure, or instinct, is of the attainable; the essence of love, for Cavalcanti, is that it seeks the unattainable. (Cf. comment on ll. 16–18.)

48, 49. Obviously only the few are capable of such love.

## JEFFERSON B. FLETCHER

To sighs the new-given quality invites;	50
Through it man sights an ever-shifting aim,	
Till in him wrath is kindled, darting flame.	
Conceive it none save one its puissance tries.	
Complies it never though it still incites;	
And no delights one seeketh in its name,	55
Neither great wisdom, sooth-or small-to frame.	

50. An ever-shifting aim. I. e., again the unattainable idea, or ideal.

#### V

A glance Love draws from like-attempered heart Which seeming right to all delight implies. In secret guise Love comes not, so declared. Indeed not scornful beauty is the dart. 60 For that way led desire through dread is wise, But merit lies with spirit that is snared. And not to sight is Love made manifest, For by its test o'ertaken man falls white; And, hears one right that form is seen by none, 65 Then least by him that is by Love undone. Of color of being Love is dispossessed. At rest in shadow space it cancels light. Without false sleight saith a faith-worthy one, That from it only is the guerdon won.

57-59. Requited love is revealed through the meeting of eyes, and seems to promise satisfaction.

60-62. Scornful beauty repels love, at least when grown wary through experience. Genuine love invites requital. Cf. Dante: Amer che a nullo amato amar perdona.

63-68. But true love is of the invisible idea, which were it to appear in its reality to mortal man, would overwhelm him utterly; of it the lover's ideal is but the reflection.

67, 68. Again, insistence on the supersensuousness of love's object, which reflected

darkly in the soul, darkens all.

70. This supersensuous ideal is the guerdon the lover seeks, and can win only through loss of his separateness from its abode in the active intelligence, that is, by loss of his separable self-consciousness. "He that loseth his life shall find it."

#### 37 T

Ode, thou mayst go thy ways, unfaltering,
Where pleases thee: I have thee so adorned
That never scorned shall be thy reasoning
By such as bring to thee intelligence:
To bide with others mak'st thou no pretence.

JEFFERSON B. FLETCHER

75

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY New York City

## GOETHE UND DIE GOTIK IN STRASSBURG

Die althergebrachte Ansicht als sei Goethe in Strassburg durch Herder zur Bewunderung der Gotik geführt worden, wie man sie ausgesprochen oder stillschweigend angenommen, in fast allen Werken über Goethe findet, z. B. in Meyers trefflichem Buch,<sup>1</sup> in Volbehr,<sup>2</sup> und Robertson<sup>3</sup> entbehrt der wissenschaftlichen Grundlage.

Erstens wissen wir dass Goethe sehon bei seiner Ankunft in Strassburg, ein volles halbes Jahr bevor er Herder kennen lernte, dem Münster erwartungsvoll entgegensah. Zwar erwartete er im Sinne des damaligen Geschmacks, "ein krausborstenes Ungeheuer" zu sehen, doch wie ganz anders kam es! Das Münster wurde der Brennpunkt seiner Begeisterung, sowohl als der des gesamten deutschen Kreises, dem er angehörte, und das Symbol für alles Grosse, das ihm in seiner neuen Umgebung aufging.

Dass er schon vor seiner Ankunft in Strassburg in Bezug auf die Gotik durch Herder angeregt worden, bleibt ausgeschlossen. Herder hatte sich über Baukunst nur im Allgemeinen ausgelassen. Zudem las Goethe die Fragmente erst 1772. Das Journal meiner Reise im Jahr 1769 war Goethe notwendigerweise noch nicht bekannt gleichfalls das vierte Wäldchen, das Herder um diese Zeit noch im Manuskript bei sich trug.

Zudem ist das Urteil Herders im *Journal meiner Reise*, u. s. w., nichts weniger als lobend; es stimmt vielmehr noch ganz in die landläufige Verachtung der Gotik ein.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Meyer, Goethe, Berlin, 1905, I, S. 345.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Volbehr, Goethe und die bildende Kunst, Lpzg., 1895, p. 113.

<sup>3</sup> Robertson, A History of German Literature, Putnam, 1902, pp. 96, 311, 313.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> An Herder, Wetzlar, Mitte Juni, 1772.

<sup>5</sup> Journal meiner Reise, u. s. w., Ausgabe des Bibl. Inst., pp. 415 f.: "Unsere gotische Fratzen und Altweiber-Märchen sind sehr schlechte erste Formen; die ersten Eindrücke von Tempeln und Religion sind gotisch, dunkel und oft ins Abenteuerliche und Leere; die ersten Bilder sind nürnbergersche Kupferstiche; die ersten Romane Magellonen und Olympieen; wer denkt wohl daran in der ätsäk die ersten Töne schon sanft, harmonisch, melodisch sein zu lassen? Daher kommt's auch, dass unsere Seelen in dieser gotischen Form veralten, statt dass sie, in den Begriffen der Schönheit erzogez, ihre erste Jugend wie im Paradiese der Schönheit geniessen würden. Hier sind aus meinem Beispiel die Folgen klar. Nach den ersten Eindrücken meiner Erziehung hat sich viel von meiner Denkart, von der Bestimmung zu einem Stande, vielleicht auch von meinem Studieren, meinem 427]

Zwar wird mancher schliessen: Herders Betonen des Urwüchsigen und Natürlichen hatte Goethe beeinflusst. Das wollen wir dahingestallt sein lassen. Gewiss ist, Herder ist, selbst nachdem er Goethe's Aufsatz Von deutscher Baukunst 1773 in seine Aufsatz-Sammlung: Von deutscher Art und Kunst aufgenommen, niemals voll auf die Gotikbegeisterung seines Jüngers eingegangen. Dass Herder von dieser Zeit ab "der geschichtlichen Würdigung der Gotik unwandelbar treu geblieben" sei, ist richtig—doch hat das mit unserer Frage nichts zu tun. Ueberhaupt, kann man sich Herder anders als "der geschichtlichen Würdigung einer Richtung treu" denken? War er es doch, der den Grundsatz der geschichtlichen Würdigung aufstellte!

Woher dieser Mangel an Begeisterung, die ihm doch so nahe gelegt wurde? Erstens hatte sich Herder für die Baukunst nie recht erwärmen können. So kam auch in seinem System der Künste in seinem vierten Kritischen Wäldchen² die Baukunst schlimm weg, da für sie kein Platz übrig blieb und sie, weil nicht nachahmend, als eine verschönerte, mechanische unter die unwahren Künste eingereiht werden sollte. Und zweitens, und dies ist der Hauptgrund, stimmte Herder nicht mit denen überein, welche die Gotik schlechthin zur deutschen Kunst stempeln und als Ausfluss des deutschen Volksgeistes ansehen wollten, somit vorzüglich auch nicht mit Goethe.<sup>3</sup>

Ausdruck u. s. w. gerichtet. Was kann aus einer in Geschichte und Religion gotisch verdorbenen Jugendseele werden? Und was würde aus einer werden können, die mit den schönsten Begriffen des Schönen genährt würde?"

Ebenda, S. 423: "Es wird die Zeit kommen, da unsere Musik erscheinen wird wie unsere gotische Baukunst, auch künstlich im Kleinen und nichts im Grossen-keine Simplizität, kein menschlicher Ausdruck, kein Eindruck."

Ideen, Ausg. des Bibl. Inst., S. 423: "Ihr Distrikt enthielt, wie ein Stück der gotischen Baukunst alles im Kleinen, was das Reich im Grossen hatte."

Ebenda, S. 459: "Kurz was unter dem gedrückten Gewölbe der Hierarchie, Lehnherrschaft und Schirmvogtei entstehen konnte, ist entstanden; dem festen Gebäude gotischer Bauart schien nur eins zu fehlen: Licht. Lasset uns sehen, auf wie sonderbaren Wegen ihm dieses zukam."

1 Hettner, Gach. d. d. Litt. im 18 Jh., Bd. 3, S. 50.

 $^2S\bar{a}mmtliche~Wke.,$ ed. Suphan, Bd. 4, S. 123. Vgl. ebenda, S. 192, wo wieder von der Baukunst als einer niedrigstehenden gesprochen wird.

<sup>3</sup> Ideen, S. 482: "Auch in einigen Künsten, z. B. der Baukunst, ist vieles von dem, was wir gotischen Geschmack nennen, eigentlich arabischer Geschmack, der sich nach den Gebäuden, die diese rohen Eroberer in den griechischen Provinzen fanden, in iher eignen Weise bildete, mit ihnen nach Spanien herüberkam und von da weiterhin sich fortpflanzte."

Heute hat sich Herders Ansicht ja bewahrheitet. Wir wissen, dass der Spitzbogenstil viel früher im Orient als in Europa in Gebrauch war, auch dass die Gotik ihre früheste Gestaltung auf europäischen Boden im nördlichen Spanien, Oberitalien, Sizilien, sodann im nördlichen Frankreich erfuhr.

Ebenso wahr ist es, dass die Gotik das erlesenste Gefäss wurde, dem deutschen Geist seinen charakteristischsten Ausdruck zu verleihen.

Wie kommt Goethe zu seiner Gotikbewunderung, wenn nicht durch Herder? Der erste, der im Gegensatz zur allgemeinen Verachtung der Gotik für diese eine Lanze bricht, ist wohl Gerstenberg.¹ Bisher hatte das Wort gotisch, welches zuerst von italienischen Renaissance-Gelehrten auf den schwerfälligen ausländischen Stil angewendet worden, die Bedeutung barbarisch; nicht etwa, weil die Goten ihn in Italien eingeführt—das hatten sie nicht—sondern weil der ausländische Stil ihnen schwerfällig und unbeholfen erschien, und ihnen das Wort gotisch gleich barbarisch oder unkultiviert galt. In diesem Sinne kannte Goethe das Wort von Boileau her. Zu Goethes Zeit hatte das Wort in Deutschland die Bedeutung altfränkisch, wunderlich. So spricht Lessing von jener Höflichkeit "wo der Verfasser tragisch sein will und gotisch und burlesque wird." Auch Schiller: "Wechselt das Lächerliche nicht zu gotisch mit dem Rührenden und Schrecklichen ab."

Goethe selbst braucht das Wort noch in diesem Sinne in Briefen aus der leipziger Zeit; und selbst noch im Jahre 1778,<sup>2</sup> sowohl als Wagner in seiner *Kindermörderin*<sup>3</sup> (1776).

Um die Stellungnahme Goethes zur Gotik zu veranschaulichen, müssen wir auf die leipziger und frankfurter Zeit zurückgehen. Durch Oeser auf das Natürliche hingewiesen teilt Goethe mit ihm die Liebe zu Wieland, Shakespere und der niederländischen Malerei. Schon in der 2. frankfurter Periode waren ihm Wieland, Shakespere

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Briefe über die Merkwürdigkeiten der Litteratur, Schleswig u. Lelpzig, 1766, 4. Brief: "Der Genius des Dichters, sein poetisches Verdienst, hätte uns sicher bis ans Ende geführt: wir hätten ein hohes gotisches Gebäude erhalten, dem zwar viele kleine Feinheiten der Kunst mangelten, das aber durch sein ehrwürdiges feyerliches Ansehen jedem, der es sihe, einen Schauer der Bewunderung abdrünge." Obwohl Goethe Gerstenbergs Schriften schon in Leipzig kannte, ist eine besondere Beeinflussung Goethes von dieser Seite in Fragen der Gotik nicht nachzuweisen.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>An Oeser, d. 15, Jan. 1778.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> In D. N. L., Bd. 80, p. 290.

und Oeser seine "echten Lehrer"—und an allen diesen war es die Tendenz auf das Natürliche die ihn anzog.

Oeser hatte ihn zwar das Evangelium der "stillen Einfalt und edeln Grösse" gelehrt, doch hatte sich Goethe nun unter frankfurter Einflüssen—Mysticismus, schwankender Gesundheit u. s. w.—ein eigenes Schönheitsideal herausgebildet, das er unterm Datum des 13. Feb. 1769 gegen Friederike Oeser so ausdrückt: "Und was ist Schönheit? Sie ist nicht Licht und nicht Nacht. Dämmerung; eine Gebuhrt von Wahrheit und Unwahrheit. Ein Mittelding. In ihrem Reiche liegt ein Scheideweg so zweideutig, so schielend, ein Hercules unter den Philosophen könnte sich vergreifen."

Hierin trifft, beiläufig gesagt, er merkwürdigerweise mit Herders gleichzeitigen Aeusserungen im *Journal meiner Reise*, u. s. w., zusammen, ohne jedoch von ihm noch auch von Hamann beeinflusst zu sein.

Auch in der Religion neigt Goethe zum dämmerigen Mysticismus, sowie in seinen alchymistischen Studien zur Naturmystik, wie das ja alles als Reaktion gegen die in seiner Jugendzeit herrschende Aufklarung nicht befremdet.

Dieses alles liess in der ersten strassburger Zeit nicht von ihm. Erstens stellte sich seine Gesundheit nur langsam her. Die mystische Lektüre der zweiten frankfurter Periode wird fortgesetzt. Das Münster, seine bedeutendste Schwärmerei ergötzte ihn besonders in der Dämmerung oder bei Nacht. So zog ihn auch Jung Stilling durch seine schwärmerische Mystik an.

Dass diese Vorliebe für die Dämmerung später durch Herder gefördert wurde, besonders durch die Einführung in Hamanns Schriften, deren "zweideutiges Doppellicht" ihn anzog, wird von Goethe selbst bezeugt. Uns war es hier nur darum zu tun, zu zeigen, dass diese Stimmung schon vor der Bekanntschaft mit Herder bei Goethe vorwaltete.

Dass Herder Goethe gelehrt habe, die Gotik des Münsters zu verstehen und zu würdigen, wie Volbehr (S. 111 f.) behauptet, ist wohl wahr, jedoch in anderem Sinne als Volbehr meint. Die Stelle, auf die er seine Annahme stützt, lautet: "Was ich mir weder das erste Mal noch in der nächsten Zeit ganz deutlich machen konnte,

war, dass ich dieses Wunderwerk als ein ungeheures gewahrte, das mich hätte erschrecken müssen, wenn es mir nicht zugleich als ein Geregeltes fasslich und als ein Ausgearbeitetes sogar angenehm vorgekommen wäre."

Die Frage, wann der Zeitpunkt dieser Erkenntnis gekommen sei, glaubt Volbehr zu beantworten, wenn er sagt: "Als Herder Goethe darüber aufklärte." Dafür gibt es weder in Goethes noch in Herders Schriften einen Stützpunkt. Die Frage wird von Goethe beantwortet¹ und zwar so: "Je mehr ich die Fassade desselben betrachtete desto mehr bestärkte und entwickelte sich jener erste Eindruck," u. s. w.

Die Erkenntnis kam ihm also allmählig, was ja auch das einzig annehmbare ist, denn unmöglich hatte die schwärmerische Begeisterung, die Goethe und der ganze deutsche Kreis, dem er angehörte, dem Münster entgegenbrachten ein volles halbes Jahr und noch länger dauern können, wenn sie ihm als einem Unverstandenen gegenüber gestanden hätten.

Dass Goethes Verständnis für die Gotik durch Herder vertieft wurde, davon ist ja schon der Aufsatz Von deutscher Baukunst Zeuge, hatte er ja auch im 4. Kritischen Wäldchen dem Untersucher des Schönen, das Studium der Baukunst angelegenlichst empfohlen.

Zusammenfassend sahen wir Goethe in der ersten strassburger Zeit als Schüler Oesers, Lessings und Winckelmanns, der wohl weiss, was griechische Schönheit bedeutet, als einen stark zum Mysticismus neigenden angehenden Stürmer und Dränger mit einem Zug nach dem Urwüchsigen und dem Nationalen. So erschienen ihm z. B. die Niederländer besser als das Rococo und die Schönheitsimpelei der Zeit. Und was konnte dem mystischen Zuge besser entgegenkommen als die in romantisches Halbdunkel gehüllte Tat des Meister Erwin!

Was Oeser ihn gelehrt, dass Anschauung mehr wert sei als Theorie, ging ihm beim Anblick des grössten Kunstwerkes, das ihm bisher vorgekommen, auf. Hier war das Werk, das Goethes eigenes Wesen in jener Periode am vollkommensten ausdrückte! Hier vor allem das Helldunkle der Dämmerung, hier das Männliche, das er dem verstorbenen Meister nachrühmt, hier die regellose

<sup>1</sup> Dichtung und Wahrh., II, S. 270.

Willkür, wie sie der angehende Shakesperejünger, der Dichter des Götz liebte! Hier glaubte er auch, und mit ihm viele seiner Zeitgenossen, eine nationale deutsche Baukunst vor sich zu haben, weswegen er sie kurzweg die deutsche Baukunst nennt.

Wie verachtet die Gotik bisher gewesen, ist allbekannt. Nachdem durch Winckelmanns und Raphael Mengs Vorgehen die Antike den Barockstil abgelöst hatte, konnte die Gotik ebenso wenig zu Wort kommen als in der Zeit, da man gotische Kirchen in Porzellanfabriken umbaute und zierliche Spitzbogen mit Rococoornamentation überkleisterte. Es ist die Zeit, da Männer wie Mozart, Klopstock und Sulzer in Nürnberg nichts als eine altfränkische Provinzstadt zu sehen vermögen, und da selbst ein Lessing für die Gotik kein Wort übrig hat.

Die Gotik als grosse, echte und zugleich deutsche Kunst angepriesen und zum Ansehen gebracht zu haben, ist Goethes eigenste Tat.

CHARLES H. HANDSCHIN

